

THE
DUBLIN REVIEW.

JUNE, 1851.

- ART. I.—1. *Petri Lombardi Novariensis Cognomine Magistri Sententiarum, Episcopi Parisiensis, Sententiarum, Libri Quatuor.* Parisiis excudebat Migne. 1841.
2. *Divi Thomæ Aquinatis Doctoris Angelici opera.* Accedunt vita seu eulogium ejus a Jacobo Echardo, diligentissime conminnatum, et Bernardi, M. de Rubeis in singula opera dissertationes præviæ. 28 tom. 4o. Venetiis. 1775.
3. *R. P. F. Joannis Duns Scoti Doctoris subtilis ordinis Minorum opera omnia quæ hucusque reperiri potuerunt.* A. PP. Hibernis Collegii Romani S. Isidori, Professoribus. 12 tom. Lugduni. 1639.
4. *Jacobi Bruckeri, Reg. Soc. Scient. Berolin. membri, Historia critica Philosophiæ a Christo Nato ad Repurgatas usque literas.* 6 tom. Lipsiæ. 1743.
5. *Johannis Baptisti Gener Theologi Hispani Theologia Dogmatica Scholastica, &c.* 6 tom. Romæ. 1767.
6. *View of the state of Europe during the Middle Ages.* By HENRY HALLAM.
7. *Traité des Etudes Monastiques divisé in trois parties, &c.* Par Dom MABILLON. 1 tom. Paris. 1691.
8. *Dionysii Octaviis de Theologicis Dogmatibus.* 6 tom. Venetiis. 1721.

WE might have placed at the head of this article the names of Isidore of Seville, of Lanfranc, of Anselm, and of Bernard, and of many other mediæval writers whose works we have been obliged to consult, but we thought it would be useless to encumber the page with a catalogue which but few would take the trouble of perusing. It is still less likely that, in this age, when men travel by steam, and speak by electricity, even those who amuse themselves by publishing prolix disquisitions on their works and opinions, and by condemning both in the most absolute and relentless manner, could be induced to interrupt the

pleasant and easy occupation of imaginative compositions, and to devote a short time to the perusal of the writings of the monks and schoolmen of the Middle Ages. Their present mode of proceeding very much resembles that of the Knight of La Mancha, who commanded all those whom he met to acknowledge that Dulcinea del Tohoso was the most beautiful lady in the world. Some persons were so unreasonable as to say, that they could not tell whether she was beautiful or not until they had seen her. But Don Quixote at once declared that this would spoil the whole matter—that if they saw her, they would have no merit for acknowledging her charms, and that the beauty of the thing consisted in their being obliged to swear, without ever having seen her, that she far surpassed all others. For the application of this story to the traducers of the Middle Ages, we can appeal, not only to Brucker, who acknowledges that he had not read the scholastics, but even to that very conceited person, Mr. Hallam, who, not content with professing his own ignorance of a subject on which he dogmatizes with the most insolent flippancy, declares that he “cannot bring himself to think that so many as eight living English writers have read even a part of Thomas Aquinas.* And yet, perhaps, it would not be unreasonable to expect that those who endite prolix dissertations on the scholastics, would read a little of Aquinas, and even of Scotus, who were the giants of their generation, who divided between them the empire of mind during no inconsiderable period, and whose works were read and commented on for centuries in every university in Europe.

It is only fair, however, to warn the English student who may wish to read a portion of the scholastics, that he will require to prepare himself for this study, by making himself acquainted with the philosophical terms which were in use in those times. This will not surprise us, when we remember that, in the Middle Ages, Theology was regarded as the chief of all the sciences, and that even at the present day, amongst ourselves, every science has its peculiar vocabulary. To those who are acquainted with the Latin and Greek languages, it is not difficult to acquire a knowledge of the philosophical terms of the scholastics; and yet, from the want of this knowledge, poor Mr. Hallam acknow-

* Hallam's *State of Europe during the Middle Ages*. Vol. II. c. ix. part 2. p. 230. note.

ledges, in the note already referred to, that he was sadly puzzled by some extracts from Duns Scotus, and Ockham, which he found in Turner. This is necessary to understand the letter of their writing, but something more is required to enter into their spirit. We must remember that these writers were men who fled from the world to seek religion and virtue in the seclusion of the cloister, and who thought that the great object of this life was to prepare for eternity. This doctrine is not acceptable to the worshippers of this nineteenth century, this age of enlightenment and progress in which we glory so much, and which we contrast so boastfully with those which preceded it, for if it were to be judged by the pursuits and occupations in which it is almost exclusively employed, we would be apt to conclude that it had no practical belief in any world but the present. Mammon is almost the only god who is now sincerely worshipped. In his service ships are built, railways are made, genius is toiling day and night, and the press teems with countless publications. And this age is jealous of its god, and calls those other ages dark, benighted, and ignorant, which placed another God before him, and in which old monks and schoolmen devoted their fortunes and their lives to the building and endowment of a vast number of houses, where the poor were fed and instructed, and in which they shut themselves up to spend their time in prayer and study, and in teaching mankind, by word and example, to look to a future world for true and permanent happiness.

But if the writers of the present day have neither time nor inclination to read the works of the scholastics, it is not, perhaps, unreasonable to ask them to abstain from reproaching those of whom they confessedly know nothing. Neither do we think that we require too much from those who have hitherto derived their notions of "lazy monks and barbarous schoolmen," from partial and ill-informed witnesses, when we entreat them to listen to a few, out of the many things which may be urged in favour of men to whose industry and piety we owe, at all events, the preservation of ancient learning, and what is of infinitely greater importance, of the Bible itself, as well as of the christian religion.

Although all the Protestant historians who have written professedly or incidentally concerning the Middle Ages, have not stated in express terms that the Catholic Church,

and especially the monks and schoolmen, were the cause of the darkness which then prevailed, yet this is most certainly the impression which, with very few exceptions, their works are calculated to leave on the mind of the reader. To remove so false and so unjust an imputation, it will be necessary to mention very briefly the causes which led to the decline of polite learning during the Middle Ages, from which we hope it will be clear to every impartial man, that we owe to the Church the preservation of the literary treasures of antiquity, as well as the knowledge of religion; and that her *ignorant* schoolmen contributed as largely to the revival of letters, as her *lazy* monks did to the cultivation of the soil, and to the advancement of practical agriculture. Even to this day, the land which surrounds the ruins of ancient abbeys and conventual churches, is distinguished by its superior fertility.* Indeed we are told continually that the old monks and friars knew very well how to take care of themselves, as they always selected the richest and most beautiful spots for the sites of their monasteries. Yet no statement could be more directly contrary to the truth than this is. A writer,† who openly avows his dislike of the institutions of the Catholic Church, is obliged to make the following admissions on this subject. "The devastation of war from the fifth to the seventh century, rendered land the least costly of all gifts, though it must always be the most truly valuable and permanent. Many of the grants to monasteries, which strike us as enormous, were of districts absolutely wasted,

*From the place where we write, we can look out upon the ivy-clad walls of an old monastery, in which no one has dwelt for three centuries, and yet the banks and slopes around it, which have never since been cultivated, are covered with a profusion of sweet violets. These violets are all perfectly white, whereas the wild violet is of the common colour, and, at least, in this part of the country entirely devoid of perfume.

† Hallam's *State of Europe*, &c. vol. 2, c. ix. p. 272. "Of the Anglo-Saxon husbandry, we may remark," says Sharon Turner, (*Hist. of Anglo-Saxons*, vol. 2. p. 167.) "the Domesday survey gives us some indication that the cultivation of the Church-lands was much superior to that of any other order of society." Those who may desire to be more fully informed upon this, as well as upon other subjects connected with the Middle Ages, should read that admirable book, Maitland's "*Dark Ages*."

which would probably have been reclaimed by no other means. We owe the agricultural restoration of a great part of Europe to the monks. They chose, for the sake of retirement, secluded regions which they cultivated with the labour of their hands. Several charters are extant, granted to convents, and sometimes to laymen, of lands which they had recovered from a desert condition, after the ravages of the Saracens."

The ancient French historian 'Mezeray, (quoted by Stuart, History of Armagh, Introduction, p. 50,) thus speaks of the services which were rendered to France by the Monks who went to it, especially from Ireland, during the sixth and seventh centuries.

"It must be admitted," he says, (Tom. i., p. 174-6, Edit. Ams. 1688,) "that these troops of pious men were most useful to France, even in her temporal concerns. For the prolonged irruptions of the barbarians having totally desolated the country, it was even yet in many places covered with woods and thickets, and in the low grounds inundated with marshes. These benevolent religious who had not devoted themselves to God, merely to lead a life of slothful indolence, laboured with their own hands, to grub up, to drain, to till, to plant, and to build, not so much for themselves, who lived in the strictest frugality, but to support and nourish the poor. So that uncultivated and frightful deserts were converted into agreeable and very fertile tracts. Heaven seemed to favour, with its kindest influence, a country managed by hands so pure and disinterested. I shall say nothing of their having preserved to us almost all that remains of the history of those ages."

Different authors have assigned a very unequal duration to the period which they have designated as the "Middle, or Dark Ages." Robertson, in the "View of Europe," prefixed to the History of Charles V., is content with four centuries, that is, from the seventh to the eleventh, including the latter. Mr. Maitland, librarian to the Archbishop of Canterbury, has admirably illustrated this period in his "Dark Ages," and has shown the utter ignorance and perversion of facts on which, to use his own words, "such miserable second-hand writers, as Robertson and Jortin," have grounded their abuse of it. Other writers have added to this period a century or two; but Mr. Hallam has extended it so as to embrace a period of a thousand years, that is, from the end of the fifth to the end of the fifteenth

century. "The Middle Ages," says this writer,* "according to the division I have adopted, comprise about one thousand years, from the invasion of France by Clovis, to that of Naples by Charles VIII. This period considered as to the state of society, has been esteemed dark through ignorance, and barbarous through poverty and

* *State of Europe*, vol. ii., chap. 9, part i., p. 207. Since the days of Robertson no historical writer has been more overrated than Mr. Hallam. It is quite evident that his knowledge of the middle ages is derived, to a considerable extent, from Robertson; for he repeats some of the second-hand "proofs and illustrations" of that writer, which he could not have done if he had looked into the authors whom he quotes. As an instance we beg to refer to the chapter just quoted, pp. 231-2, in which he extracts a ridiculous definition of a christian from the sermons of St. Eligius, who was bishop of Noyon in 646. He admits, in a note to the fourth edition of his work, that this passage was quoted by Robertson, and that to him he was perhaps immediately indebted for it, and moreover, that Dr. Lingard has proved it to be a complete misrepresentation of Eligius. Yet (1) he asserts that "no one is, in fact, to blame for this misrepresentation, which being contained in popular books, has gone forth so widely; and, (2) after admitting that Eligius never gave any such definition of a Christian, he still retains the following passage in the text of his book, for which, of course, he is not to be blamed. "With such a definition," he says, "of a Christian, it is not surprising that any fraud and injustice became honourable when it contributed to the riches of the clergy, and glory of their order."

In the first of the pages just referred to (231), Mr. Hallam has given vent to one of those wholesale attacks upon monks and nuns, and the religious institutions of the Middle Ages, with which certain flimsy Protestant writers have rendered us so familiar. The sole authority which he produces to sustain his charges, not only against men, but against a whole sisterhood of religious ladies, is Eligius's definition of a good Christian, a passage from Clemangis, and the visitation under Henry VIII! It is as ridiculous to attach any weight to the reports of a commission which was issued for the purpose of enabling the king to plunder the religious houses, as to place it in the middle ages. We make Mr. Hallam a present of Henry VIII. and his commission, although we think he should have been satisfied with the thousand years within which period of darkness he promised to confine himself. He confesses, as we have seen, that the passage from Eligius has been completely falsified, and that it should never again be quoted for such purposes as it has been hitherto adduced to support. And yet Eligius alone, of the writers whom he quotes to prove the crimes of the

want of refinement. We begin in darkness and calamity, and though the shadows grow fainter as we advance, yet we are to break off our pursuit as the morning breathes upon us, and the twilight reddens into the lustre of day." It is enough to observe with regard to this extraordinary

monks and clergy of the Middle Ages can, with any propriety, be said to belong to that dark period, for his only remaining authority, Clemangis, died about the year 1440. We must therefore take Mr. Hallam's word for the crimes which occurred in the interval between the seventh and fifteenth century.

But as Clemangis is an especial favourite with Protestants, it is worth while to examine his testimony a little more closely. The title of the work quoted as his is Nicholai de Clemangis, *Scriptoris Vetusti de corrupto Ecclesiæ statu studio Johannis a Fuchthe, 1620*. In the first place it is quite uncertain who is the author of this tract. Many persons (see Feller, Dict. Biog. at this word, &c.,) consider it almost certain that it was not written by Clemangis. There is no contemporary evidence whatever of its authenticity. The very words "ancient writer," which are applied to Clemangis in the title page, may suggest a doubt which will be confirmed by the commencement of the tract itself. It begins thus, Nicolai de Clemangis Catalaun. *Deploratio Calamitatis Ecclesiæ per schisma nefaudissimam iltatæ cum annexa exhortatione Pontificum ad ejus extirpationem. Hoc manuscriptum suo Johanni Martini Lydio communicavit Antonius Thysius Theologus*. So that, in fact, although the name of Clemangis appears in the title of this tract, it cannot be traced back to him. It may perhaps suggest an additional doubt to mention, that in Trinity College, Dublin, the tract *De corrupto Ecclesiæ statu* is bound up in a small duodecimo, with another little work, in which the authorship of the *Imitation of Christ* is falsely ascribed to Gerson. As Mr. Hallam never saw the work, of course he is not to be blamed for his ignorance of these facts.

If Mr. Hallam had read the book he would have known, moreover, (1) that it is a sort of philippic in which angry declamation is not sustained by the mention of even one tangible fact. (2) That in the first twenty-three chapters the author accuses all ecclesiastical persons, of every kind and degree, of all description of crimes. In the last-named chapter he says, "Now there remains the nuns *alone*, to bring down our narrative, as we promised, from the crown of the head to the lowest footprints, without passing by any degree." Then follows the passage which Hallam has borrowed from William Prynne, in which it is asserted, "*ut idem, sit hodie puellam velare quod et publice ad scortandum exponere*. And yet, in the 25th chapter, the same man says, "But I am unwilling that any one should think on account of what I have said about ecclesiastics, that I wish to

statement, that this period extends nearly two hundred years beyond that in which Dante produced the Divine Comedy, and a hundred and fifty years beyond the time (1341) when Petrarch was crowned in the Roman Capitol!

That literature was ruined, and that great ignorance and barbarism prevailed in Europe from the sixth century is what no man can deny who is in the slightest degree

be understood of all persons of this kind, without any exception. I know that He has not lied, and that He cannot lie who has said: Peter, I have asked for thee, that thy faith fail not. (Luke 22, ver. 25.) Nor am I ignorant that in every one of the states there are some, and perhaps *very many*, good, just, innocent, and altogether free from the wickednesses which I have enumerated. Nec sum nescius in singulis quibusque statibus aliquos et forte plurimos, bonos justos, innocentes esse, ab illisque malificiis quæ supra memorata sunt separatos. This admission fortunately deprives his former declamation of all credibility, for it is much easier to believe that this writer is an anonymous slanderer, than that many virgins led a life of purity in *public* brothels. (3) That this writer does not say one word about the crimes of ecclesiastics during the Middle Ages. On the contrary, he expressly confines himself to his own time (*hodie*), and attributes the calamities of the Church to the most wicked schism—*calamitatis Ecclesiasticæ per schisma nefaudissimum illatæ*. Now this schism commenced by the election of the Antipope Clement VII., on the 27th of August, 1378, and as some time was required to produce its bad effects, this writer, whoever he may be, cannot refer to a much earlier period than the beginning of the 15th century.

We are almost ashamed to have wasted so much time on this little insignificant anonymous pamphlet; for that it was anonymous is clear from the fact that it has been attributed to John de Chelm, and several others, as well as to Clemangis. Protestants however, and Du Pin, who blames its intemperate style, attribute it to Clemangis, as they wish to give it a respectable paternity. Yet this does not mend matters much; for he was secretary to the Antipope, Peter de Luna, and was banished from France on the charge of having been the author of the letter in which that person excommunicated the king of France, in May, 1407. Du Pin supposes that he wrote the tract *De Corrupto Ecclesiæ statu*, in 1414, when his mind had been embittered by seven years exile. But whoever may have been the author of this tract, it certainly came forth as a violent anonymous philippic, in which the great and undoubted evils which were produced in the Church, by the long continuance of the schism, were grossly exaggerated. It would be easy to produce against the morals of every existing Christian society

acquainted with the history of the period. It is to the constant irruptions of barbarians, by whom the western empire was finally destroyed in 476, to the disuse of the Latin tongue, to the colonisation of Europe by countless hordes of savages, to the inroads of the Saracens, Normans, Danes, and Huns, and finally to the civil wars which ensued on the death of Charlemagne, that we are to attribute the ignorance which prevailed during the subsequent ages. But the monks and friars are so far from having caused this darkness, that it is to them, and to them alone, we owe the preservation of the literary treasures of antiquity, and the revival of learning in Europe. We shall prove this assertion by the authority of a writer whom we have already frequently quoted, and we have only to direct the attention of the reader to the harsh expressions with which he so wantonly assails those whom he acknowledges to have been the preservers of literature, in order to show that this evidence is derived from a most reluctant witness.

"If it be demanded," says Hallam, (*State of Europe*, vol. ii., chap. 9, part i., p. 222, and following,) "by what cause it happened that a few sparks of ancient learning survived throughout this long winter, we can only ascribe their preservation to the establishment of Christianity. Religion alone made a bridge, as it were, across the chaos, and has linked the two periods of ancient and modern civilisation. Without this connecting principle Europe might indeed have awakened to intellectual pursuits, and the genius of recent times needed not to be invigorated by the imitation of antiquity. But the memory of Greece and Rome would have been feebly preserved by tradition, and the monuments of those nations might have excited, on the return of civilisation, that vague sentiment of speculation and wonder with which men

far more plausible testimony than this, which might be confirmed by some terrible and undeniable facts, the like of which, had they existed, most certainly would not have been passed over by the author of the tract *De Corrupto Ecclesiæ statu*. At all events, we hope we have said enough to convince Mr. Hallam that neither Clemangis nor Eligius should ever again be quoted against the Church of the Middle Ages; and unless we greatly deceive ourselves, what we shall adduce in the course of this article, will convince every impartial man that the convents and monasteries were the asylums of virtue, as well as of learning, during those times. In both these respects Maitland justly lays it down as an undoubted fact, that ecclesiastical persons were always infinitely superior to the laity.

now contemplate Persepolis, or the Pyramids. It is not, however, from religion simply that we have derived this advantage, but from religion as it was *modified in the Dark Ages*. Such is the complete reciprocation of good and evil in the *dispensation of Providence*, that we may assert with only an apparent paradox, that had religion been more *pure*, it would have been less *permanent*, and that *Christianity has been preserved by means of its corruptions*. The sole hope for literature depended on the Latin language; and I do not see why that should not have been lost, if three circumstances in the prevailing religious system, *all* of which we are *justly* accustomed to disapprove, had not conspired to maintain it; the Papal supremacy, the monastic institutions, and the use of a Latin liturgy. (1) A continual intercourse was kept up, in consequence of the first, between Rome and the several nations of Europe; her laws were received by the bishops, her legates presided in councils; so that a common language was as necessary in the Church as it is at present in the diplomatic relations of kingdoms. (2) Throughout the whole course of the Middle Ages.....almost every distinguished man was either the member of a chapter or of a convent. The monasteries were subjected to *strict rules of discipline*, and held out, at the worst, more opportunities for study than the secular clergy possessed, and fewer for worldly dissipations. But their most important service was as secure repositories for books. *All* our manuscripts have been preserved in this manner, and could hardly have descended to us by any other channel; at least there were intervals when I do not conceive that any royal or private libraries existed. (3) Monasteries, however, would have contributed very little towards the preservation of learning, if the Scriptures and the Liturgy had been translated out of Latin when that language ceased to be intelligible.....One might presume, if such refined conjecture were consistent with historical caution, that the more learned and sagacious ecclesiastics of those times, deploring the gradual corruption of the Latin tongue, and the danger of its absolute extinction, were induced to maintain it as a sacred language, and the depository, as it were, of that truth and that science which would be lost in the barbarous dialects of the vulgar. They were habituated to the Latin words of the Church service, which had become, by this association, the readiest instrument of devotion, and with the majesty of which the Roman jargon could bear no comparison. Their musical chaunts were adapted to these sounds, and their hymns depended for metrical effect on the marked accents and powerful rhymes which the Latin language affords. The Vulgate Latin of the Bible was still more venerable. It was like a copy of a lost original; and a copy attested by one of the most eminent fathers, and by the general consent of the Church."

We have omitted nothing which could qualify this testimony, and but little of the abuse of the Church with which

the author has thought it his duty, as a good Protestant, to season his reluctant praise. Indeed, we would not wish our religion to be approved of by a man who thinks that Providence would not have preserved a pure, but that it did preserve a corrupt, faith. Still he is forced to admit that the Church had excellent reasons for not translating either the liturgies or the Bible into the barbarous, fluctuating, and often unintelligible jargon which prevailed for several centuries over Europe, after Latin ceased to be commonly spoken. She could not have changed the language of the former without destroying their dignity, and interrupting, in a matter of great moment, her connexion with the primitive ages of Christianity; nor of the latter without exposing it to certain, and, perhaps, irremediable corruption.

Brucker, another avowed enemy of the monks, is forced to admit, even whilst declaiming against their ignorance, that to the monasteries we owe the preservation, even of profane learning, during the middle ages. Having quoted a canon of the eighth Council of Toledo, A. D. 653, which prohibited a cleric to be ordained who did not know the Psalter, the hymns of the Church, and the Order of Baptism,* he asks, what must have been the ignorance of the eighth century when such was the state of things in the seventh? "Wherefore," he continues, "in this century, (eighth,) the minds of those who wished to be considered learned, were in great darkness, and the only remedy against barbarism, and that feeble and ineffectual enough, was found in the monasteries. In which at this time, those persons were to be received who had learned some few elements of the liberal arts. It hence happened that youths were prepared for this purpose; and thus some asylum was afforded to letters in these sacred places. This glory is usually attributed to St. Benedict, the father of the western monks, who, by prescribing in his rule that such of his religious as aspired to Holy Orders, should be previously instructed, caused the ascetics of his order to establish schools in their monasteries, in which polite letters, which were proscribed and banished in this age, took refuge, as in a secret retreat.†

Cassiodorus, he adds, certainly commanded his monks

* Brucker, vol. iii., p. 571.

† Ibid, 572-3.

to apply themselves to sacred and profane learning, but that it is a matter of doubt whether the application to study, which has rendered his order so famous, was derived from the original rule of St. Benedict, or afterwards ingrafted upon it. Into this controversy he declares that he will not enter, as the Benedictines have most learned men, who are perfectly able to uphold the glory of their order. But this, he says, he thinks it necessary to place beyond all doubt, that the torrent of barbarism was arrested by the aid of some monasteries; and that from the ninth century, the Benedictines had always been most distinguished in every kind of learning. "With the arms of the barbarians," he continues, "barbarism triumphed, which (not the monks, but) the Longobardi carried with them into Italy, the Saracens, &c., into Spain and Gaul. Britain alone, an island happy in the cultivation of letters, received exiled learning with open arms, and embraced philosophy, which had become an outcast along with the sister sciences, and so deformed as scarcely to be known. This glory belongs, in the first place and especially, to Ireland, whither, in this age, (eighth century,) the English were even yet accustomed to seek learning." On this subject Camden says: "Our Anglo-Saxons flocked in that age from all parts into Ireland, as to the mart of learning. Hence our writers say, in their histories of holy men: 'He went to school in Ireland.'" Brucker adds, that Camden proves this correctly by the following lines from the life of Sulgen:

"Qui postquam nablam primo tener edidit infans
 Perlustrat scholas studio florente Britannas
 At crescente simul ardore et tempore multo
 Exemplo patrum commotus amore legendi
 Ivit ad Hibernos sophia mirabile claros." *

Brucker adduces a great many other authorities to prove the superiority of the Irish in learning, in the seventh, eighth, and ninth centuries. He quotes Eric of Auxerre, who says, in a letter to Charles the Bald, that nearly all Ireland, despising the dangers of the seas, had migrated to foreign lands, bringing her crowds of philosophers along with her, and mentions John Scotus Erigena, and the

* Id. Ibid, p. 574.

learned men whom Alcuin, in the life of Willibrard, declares to have imbibed their learning in Ireland.

It is certainly not a little singular, that a country which was alike a stranger to the arms and the arts of Rome, which was regarded by the proud mistress of the world and her refined provincials, as a barbarous island, which was situated beyond the utmost limits of civilisation, should have become the school of Europe. Indeed, learning almost immediately followed the introduction of Christianity into Ireland. Sedulius, an elegant writer of Latin poetry in the fifth century, calls himself an Hibernian Scot, in his comment on St. Paul's Epistles. Music, the twin sister of poetry, also flourished in Ireland from a very early period, for Fleury* relates, that in the seventh century, Gertrude, the daughter of Pepin, sent to Ireland for learned men, to instruct the religious of the abbey of Neville, and for musicians and chaunters, to teach them church harmony, or psalmody. Stuart, (Introduction, p. 49,) quotes some beautiful lines from Bonaventura Moronus, a Tarentine, † in praise of Cataldus, the famous

* Hist. Ecclesiast, tom. viii, edit. in 12mo, p. 521. For this, and most of what follows regarding Irish schools, I am indebted to Stuart's Hist. of Armagh, (Introduction, and Appendix v. at end of volume.) He displays a good deal of research, but the narrative is very confused.

† We cannot help quoting some of these lines, which prove that multitudes, from all parts of Europe, sought learning in Ireland in the 7th century.

"Spargitur occiduas sensim vaga fama per urbes,
Huic Juveni primis tantum conatibus omnes
Concecisse viros, eadem quos edidit ætas,
Quantum ignes superat Phœbe, jam plena minores.
Undique conveniunt proceres; quos dulces trahebat
Discendi studium, major nunc cognita virtus.
An laudata foret. Celeres vastissima Rheni
Jam vada Teutonici, jam deseruere Sicambri:
Mittit ab extremo gelidos Aquilone Boemos
Albis et Arverni coeunt, Batavique frequentes
Et quicumque colunt alta sub rupe Gebennas.
Non omnes prospectat Arar, Rhodanique fluenta
Helvetias: multos desiderat Ultima Thule.
Certatim hi properant diverso tramite ad Urbem
Lesmoriam, Juvenis primos ubi transigit annos

Irish monk, who presided over the great school of Lismore, in the seventh century. Having resigned this charge, he went to Jerusalem, and thence to Italy, where he was chosen Bishop of Tarentum. Colgan has transcribed an epitaph, placed under his image at Rome, which records his birth, travels, and death:

"Me tulit Hiberne, Salymæ traxere, Tarenum
Num tenet: huic ritus, dogmata, jura dedis."

Bede, (*Hist. Ecc. Brit.*, lib. iii, c. 7, and lib. iv., c. 26,) Alcuin *vita S. Willibrordi*, (lib. ii., c. iv,) and Eric of Auxerre *de Mirac. S. Germani*, lib. i., cap. ult.,) relate the vast number of foreign students who flocked to Ireland. These students were treated with great hospitality, and such as we can now scarcely bring ourselves to believe; for we are told, that they were not only educated gratuitously, at the public schools, but also supplied with diet, lodging, clothes, and books. But before the incredulous reader rejects this fact, he should recollect that "poor scholars," who were educated, clothed, and fed gratuitously, were very common, even in the present century, in some parts of the province of Munster, and that they have not until within the last few years entirely disappeared.

The sciences and liberal arts taught in the Irish schools were Grammar, Rhetoric, Logic, Arithmetic, Music, Geometry, Astronomy, and Theology. Of these, the last seven were methodically comprised and digested in a disquisition which had been written by Martianus Capella, in the fifth century. (*Fabricius Bib. Lat.*, p. 638, *Ledwich Antiq.*, p. 352.) On this author, John Scot Erigena wrote comments, and Dumont, an Irish bishop, delivered lectures in St. Remigius' monastery, in Down. These works are still extant. (*Ledwich and Fabricius ubi sup.* *Warton's Hist. of English Poetry*, vol. ii., p. 75-6. See *Stuart*, Appendix v., p. 594.) Certainly the Irish must have made considerable progress in the higher branches of

Mirantur tandem cuncti quod cognitus heros
Spe major, fama melior, preconia laudum
Exuperet, nullumque parem fert æmula virtus.
Jam videas populos quos abluit advena Rhenus
Quosque sub acciduo colustrat Cardine Mundi
Phœbus Lesmoriam venisse; ut jura docentis
Ediscant titulisque sacrent melioribus aros."

mathematics, as a little before the middle of the eighth century, St. Feargall, known on the continent by the name of Virgil, maintained the sphericity of the earth, and the existence of the antipodes. St. Boniface wrote to Pope Zachary, that he asserted the existence of another race of men, (who were not, therefore, descended from Adam, and redeemed by Christ,) and of another sun, moon, and stars. The Pope said, that if he held such doctrines he ought to be condemned; but when the true nature of his doctrine was made known to the court of Rome, he was not only not condemned, but was elevated to the bishopric of Salzburg.

The proficiency which foreign students made under Irish teachers, may be inferred from the passage quoted by Stuart from Camden's *Wiltshire*, (p. 242,) in which that author says, that Adelm, an author of the seventh century, and the first of the English nation who wrote Latin poetry, was the pupil of Maidulph, an Irishman and a poet. Stuart asserts, (p. 595,) on the authority of Benedict, abbot of Aniam, in Languedoc, a writer of the eighth century, that the Irish monks had even then introduced in their own country, and upon the continent, scholastic divinity, and the use of scholastic reasoning in illustrating the doctrines of theology. This fact is in some degree confirmed by what we know of the history of John Scotus Erigena, an Irishman, of a dazzling, but rash and erratic genius, who went to France in the ninth century, and became the friend and companion of Charles the Bald. As an instance, at once, of his wit and of his familiarity with the monarch, it is related, that the king once asked, "what was the difference between a sot and a Scot," and that he instantly answered the table. He was a great linguist, for he translated from the Greek the works then falsely ascribed to Dyonysius, the Areopagite, and Aristotle's *Moralia de Secretis Secretorum* into Chaldaic, Arabic, and Latin.* He is supposed by Ussher to be the author of the excerpts in Macrobius, concerning the Greek and Latin syntaxes, and of a treatise *περι φυσικων*. His acquaintance with Aristotle renders it not improbable that the Irish writers of the two previous centuries were

* Guliel. Malm. lib. 2, digest. reg. Aug., c. 4. Tithem. de Script. Ecc. Bayle cent. 2. Script. Brit., c. 2. Quoted by Stuart, p. 594.

acquainted with that author, and that they had applied his rules to illustrate the doctrines of Theology. Indeed, from an incidental mention of Aristotle by Jugulf, abbot of Croyland, in the eleventh century, it would appear, that the works of that philosopher, or at all events his logic, had for a long time previously formed a part of the regular course of studies, for he says, that he was sent from Westminster to the school at Oxford, where he learned Aristotle, and the two first books of Tully's Rhetoric.

We think, that whoever will impartially consider these facts, that learning was so much esteemed, even in what is called the darkest portion of the Dark Ages, that crowds of students went to Ireland to acquire it, from distant countries, at a time when travelling, both by sea and land, was so difficult and dangerous,—that those students must have carried back with them the light of science, and diffused it over the continent of Europe,—that celebrated Irish scholars, such as Virgil, in the seventh century, Clement and Albin, whom we shall shortly have occasion to mention, in the eighth, and Scotus, in the ninth, who were well acquainted with Greek and Latin, and had no inconsiderable knowledge of the sciences taught upon the continent,—will be apt to conclude, that learning was in a very different state from that in which such writers as Brucker, Jortin, Robertson, and Hallam represent it to have been. If he will, moreover, condescend to recollect, that monasteries were not originally established as public schools, that they were designed as the abodes not of science,* but of retirement and of virtue, that many of the monks were mere laymen, who were no more bound to be learned than their neighbours, and that a good priest might be satisfied with a knowledge of Holy Scripture and religion, and might consider it, perhaps, somewhat inconsistent with his calling †

* See Mabillon's *Traité des Etudes monastique*, part 1.

† Not only Gregory the Great, who says, (Ep. 48,) *Quia in uno se ora Jovis laudibus Christi laudes non Capiunt*, who calls St. Benedict *Scienter nesciens et sapienter indoctus*, and who wrote to Didier, Bishop of Vienne, against profane studies; but Gregory Nazianzine, and Basil, *Carmen de vita Monastica*, will allow monks to study only the Holy Scriptures, and Gregory of Nyssa gave considerable scandal to the faithful by giving up his office of reader to study rhetoric. See *Greg. Naz. Ep. 43*.

The Abbot of St. Vincent of Voltorno, Ambrose Aulbert, has

to waste his time in disseminating the elegant, but in many instances, impure, writings of the Pagans, he will surely give some credit to those old monks, who spared no pains* or labour to get correct and perfect copies of profane authors, who procured at great expense† the materials on which to copy them, who spent a large portion of their lives in the drudgery of translating, and thus received science into their sacred abodes when her sweet voice was no longer heard in the world, where men had their ears stunned by the continual clash of barbaric arms.

The inestimable services which the Monks and Clergy of the dark ages rendered to profane literature may be said to have been owing in a great measure to accidental circumstances. Their chief duty was to save their own souls and to impart a knowledge of the Gospel to christian nations. These pursuits, we should have imagined, would have appeared far nobler to a true Christian, than if they had devoted their lives to the study of mathematics and to transcribing the poets. Between the sixth and eleventh centuries, the Goths and Vandals were reclaimed from Arianism, and the idolatrous nations of Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Bulgaria, Hungary, Saxony, Poland, and Russia, were instructed in the knowledge of the true God. The Church could not prevent Christian princes from contending against each other in arms, for she could not put an end to human passions, but she at least mitigated

left the following prayer in the end of his comment on the Apocalypse: "*Neque enim ideo patriam parentesque reliqui ut mihi scientiæ dona largires; sed ut perfectione virtutum ad vitam æternam perduceres. Quod si utramque non mereor doctrinam scilicet atque operationem: aufer quæso doctrinam, tantum ut tribuas operationem virtutis.*" Even Alelard says of himself, after he became a religious: "*Se post susceptam professionem vitæ monasticæ, sacra plurimum lectioni studium intendentem, secularium artium disciplinam quibus amplius assuetus fuisset, et quas ab ipso plurimi requisi verunt non penitus abjecisse sed de iis quasi hamum quemdam fabricasse quo illas philosophico sapore incentes ad veræ philosophiæ lectionem attraheret.*"

* See a little further on.

† From the taking of Alexandria by the Saracens, in the seventh century, to the invention of making paper from cotton rags, about the end of the tenth, parchment was the only material used.

the calamities of war by bringing the savage invaders of Europe into the pale of civilized society, by mediating between the contending parties, by establishing asylums in her Churches where the vanquished could take refuge, and finally, by the institution of God's truce, by which private wars were prohibited on certain days of the week. "Truth and candour must acknowledge," says Gibbon (Decline and Fall, chap. 55, at the end), "that the conversion of the North imparted many temporal benefits both to the old and the new Christians. The rage of war inherent to the human species, could not be healed by the evangelic precepts of charity and peace, and the ambition of Catholic princes has renewed in every age the calamities of hostile contention. But the admission of the Barbarians into the pale of civil and ecclesiastical society, delivered Europe from the depredations by sea and land of the Normans, the Hungarians, and the Russians, who learned to spare their brethren and cultivate their possessions. The establishment of law and order was promoted by the influence of the clergy, *and the rudiments of arts and sciences were introduced into the savage countries of the globe.*"

The Monks not only restored agriculture in Europe, but they taught humanity to the lords of the soil, both by word and example. It may not be uninteresting to read the following brief extract from a letter written by one old Monk to another, at a time when agricultural labourers were either slaves, or worse than slaves, all over Europe. "The same argument," says Peter, the venerable Abbot of Clugni, writing to St. Bernard, about the middle of the twelfth century, "may be used as to peasants, servants, and handmaids, and by it we may most excellently prove that Monks have a legitimate right to possess them. For everybody sees how secular masters rule over their peasants, servants, and handmaids, for they are not satisfied with their accustomed and due service, but always unmercifully claim their persons with their property, and their property with their persons. Hence it is, that beside the accustomed payments, they, three or four times in the year, or as often as they please, spoil them of their goods, they oppress them with innumerable claims of service; they lay upon them grievous and insupportable burthens. Hence they force many to leave their native soil and fly to foreign parts, and (what is worse) their very persons, which

Christ hath redeemed with so rich a price, even his own blood, they are not afraid to sell for one so mean, that is for money. Now, monks, though they may have such possessions, do not possess them in the same way, but very differently; for they employ only the lawful and due services of the peasants to procure the conveniences of life. They harass them with no exactions, they impose no intolerable burthens, and if they see them in want, they maintain them at their own expense. They have servants and handmaids, not as servants and handmaids, but as brothers and sisters; and receiving from them reasonable service according to their ability, take care in return that they shall suffer no want or injury; so that they are (to use the words of the Apostle) 'as having nothing, yet possessing all things.'**

After all, these old monks, although of course they must have been horribly ignorant, seem, nevertheless, to have had a tolerably correct notion not only of the theory but, moreover, of the practice of Christian charity. If they required a reasonable quantity of work from their domestics, they were not idle themselves, for some of them, as we have seen, were employed in cultivating their fields with their own hands, many others in transcribing, and some even in composing, books. That transcribing was one of the ordinary occupations of monks even in the darkest ages, is clear, from those very instances which are adduced by popular writers to demonstrate the contrary. Robertson, in the introduction to Charles V. sect. 1, says, that "even *monasteries of considerable note* had but one missal."† The monastery of considerable note was that of St. Michael, at Pisa, and the authority on which Robertson relies, is the statement which the Abbot Bonus left of what he had done in founding and maintaining it. From this statement it appears that it was no monastery at all when it had only one missal, but a chapel, in which there

* A long extract from this letter will be found in Maitland's *Dark Ages*, from p. 387 to p. 397.

† For this fact he quotes Muratori *Antiq.* v. ix. p. 789. The reference is to the *Brevi Recordationis* of the Abbot Bonus, which Muratori has printed, not in the ninth (for there are only six altogether) but in the fourth volume of his *Antiquitates Italiæ mædii ævi*.

was neither monk nor abbot, nor any dwelling place, but merely a hut in which Bonus dwelt with his uncle. The good abbot complains not because there was only one missal in this old dilapidated chapel (for one would have been quite sufficient), but because they had not the other books required for divine service. But he boasts that after five years he restored the Church, for which he brought columns from Rome, and that he built a belfry in which he placed seven bells. He moreover procured splendid vestments for the altar, and replaced the single tin cup by four chalices, one of gold and three of silver. The single hut had expanded into a monastery with suitable offices, and a considerable estate in land; and the library contained thirty-four volumes, one of which was a Bible, for which he paid ten pounds.* Some of these books the pious abbot and his prior transcribed with their own hands. The library was indeed still small, but it was select, and as the number of transcribers certainly increased with the number of monks which it contained, we have no doubt that in a few years it contained a goodly number of volumes. Oldbert, who was abbot of Gembloux until the year 1048, and who must therefore have flourished in one of the darkest periods of the dark ages, wrote out a volume containing the whole of the Old and New Testament, and set his monks to transcribe so successfully, that he collected above an hundred volumes connected with divine scripture, and fifty upon profane subjects.† Othlonus, a monk of St. Emmerams, in the same century, has left amongst other writings, a book, "*De ipsius tentationibus, varia fortuna et Scriptis*," in which he declares that he occupied himself so constantly in writing, that he seldom got any interval of rest except on festivals. "And when," he says, "I had a mind to compose anything, I very commonly could not find time for it, except on holidays or by night, being tied down to the business of teaching the boys, and the transcribing, which I had been persuaded to undertake. Therefore, besides the books I composed myself, which I

* The whole of this *Breve Recordationes* will be found in Maitland, pp. 57—61.

† His biographer says that he did not suffer either their minds or their hands to be idle. *Mab. A. S. Tom. 8. p. 531*, quoted by Maitland in *extenso*, p. 197.

wrote to give away for the edification of those who asked for them, and of others to whom I gave them unasked, I wrote nineteen missals; three books of the Gospels, and two with the Epistles and Gospels, which are called lectionaries, besides which I wrote four service books for matins. I sent seven books to the monks of Fulda, two to the monks of Hirshfeld, one to the abbot of Amorbach, four to brother William, among which there was a very valuable missal, one book to the abbot of Lorsch, four to friends dwelling in Bohemia, one to a friend at Passau, two to the monastery of Tegernsee, a volume containing three books to the monastery of Pryel, one book and various epistles to my sister's son; three books to the monastery of Obermunster, one to that of Nidermunster, and to many other persons I gave or sent at different times, sermons, proverbs, and edifying writings." What a lazy old monk this must have been! And yet his labours are far surpassed by those of a nun who flourished about the same time. The catalogue of the works she transcribed, which is too long to be inserted here, will be found in Maitland, pp. 419—21. It contains besides a large number of missals, office books, and books of epistles and gospels, two complete Bibles, a large portion of the works of SS. Augustine, Jerome, and Gregory the Great, Origen on the Old Testament and on the Canticles, the Triplicate history of Cassiodorus, the lives of many Saints, and Eusebius' Ecclesiastical history.

No doubt the monks were chiefly employed in transcribing religious books, such as the sacred Scriptures, the writings of the Fathers, Church history, the lives of Saints, and the service books of the Church. But they by no means confined themselves to these. The Abbot Bonus, already mentioned, entreats a friend to bring him the Catiline and Jugurtha of Sallust, and one of the works of Cicero, which he had not in his library. Another old monk who lived in the tenth century, and therefore in the very darkest period, may throw some additional light on this part of our subject. He was a native of Auverne, and his name was Gerbert. Having taken the habit in a monastery in his native country, he was made Abbot of Bobbio, in Lombardy, which had been founded by the famous Irish Saint, Columbanus, in the seventh century. He afterwards taught school at Rheims, where Robert, son of Hugh Capet, was among his scholars. He was sub-

sequently raised to the Archbishopric of Ravenna, through the influence of the Emperor Otho, who had also been his pupil, and finally on the death of Gregory V. became Pope, and took the name of Sylvester II. Of his writings there are extant one hundred and forty-nine epistles, the life of St. Adalbert, Archbishop of Prague, and some works on Mathematics. In his letters, he notices his own works on rhetoric, arithmetic, and the completion of a sphere. In letter 44, to Egbert, Abbot of Tours, he mentions his diligent study of philosophy, and the arts of eloquence, and states that he had been for a long time eagerly engaged in collecting a library: for which purpose he was paying constantly, transcribers in Rome (this was before he became Pope), and other parts of Italy, as well as in Belgium and Germany. In other letters he writes to friends for parts of the works of Cicero and Boethius which were wanting in his copies; and in letter 130, which was also written long before his elevation, and addressed to a monk called Mainald, he says, "I entreat you to render me one service, which you can do without danger or injury to yourself, and which will bind me most closely to you. You know with what zeal I seek for copies of books from all quarters, and *you know how many writers there are everywhere, both in the cities and the country parts of Italy.* I entreat you then, and without any other person knowing it, and at your own cost, that transcripts be made for me of M. Manilius de Astrologia, Victorinus de Rhetorica, and the treatise of Demosthenes the philosopher, called Ophthalmicus. I promise you most faithfully that this kind service shall be kept in sacred secrecy, and that whatever you lay out I will pay you to the full, according to your accounts, and whenever you require it."*

Indeed, it is not necessary to enter into these details in order to prove that the monks devoted themselves labori-

* See a note by the Rev. H. J. Rose, printed in Maitland's *Dark Ages*, p. 56. This gentleman justly observes, "If in the tenth century we find the work of transcribing so common, that there were writers everywhere, in the cities and country places in Italy, and as it would seem from other letters, no difficulty in finding them elsewhere, if the collection of a library was so great a matter, that many were ready to assist, surely matters were far different from our common notions. For some further account of Gerbert's works, see Mabillon *Analect*. Tom. ii, p. 215.

ously and incessantly to the work of transcribing, for are we not indebted to their pens for all the vast treasures of sacred and profane literature which have been handed down to us from ancient times? Maitland declares (p. 290) that although Mabillon and his companions did not think of mentioning the manuscripts of the Scriptures which they met with in their literary journey, "unless some accidental circumstance rendered them remarkable, yet it would be easy to specify a hundred copies of the whole or parts of the Bible, which they happen thus to mention, and which had existed during the dark ages." These are but a small proportion of the copies which must have survived all the calamities of near a thousand years, the ravages of war, of fire, of Danes, Hungarians, and housemaids.* Will so many of all those which at present exist remain after a similar period, if they should be obliged to pass through as many and as great vicissitudes? The following story, which belongs to the tenth century, will give some idea of the literary labour of the monks during that dark period. Whilst the Abbot Hugo was extending the fame and dependencies of Clugni by the ministry of the monk Ulric, William, a Bavarian by birth, was Abbot of Hirschau. He was educated in St. Emmeram in Ratisbon, and "in a short time became very learned," says Tithemius,† "in all kinds of knowledge. In philosophy he became a most acute disputant; in music he was unusually learned, and composed many and various chants in honour of the saints. How skilful he was in astronomy, mathematics, and arithmetic, his works testify: on these subjects he bestowed much pains." Although he was continually sending out colonies of monks to the religious houses which he founded, yet he contrived to keep up the number of a hundred and fifty in his own monastery, who "were perpetually engaged either in the performance of divine service, or in prayer, meditation, and sacred reading. Those who appeared less fit to be employed in sacred things, were appointed to perform such manual labours as were necessary, so that none of their time might pass in

* For the share these last had in the work, see "Letters of Eminent persons, from the Bodleian, vol. i. p. 140, quoted by Maitland, p. 277.

† Chron. Hirsang, tom. i. p. 221. Sub. Am. 1070, see Maitland, p. 328—332.

idleness. The holy father knowing moreover what he had learned by laudable experience, that sacred reading is the necessary food of the mind, made twelve of his monks very excellent writers, to whom he committed the office of transcribing the holy Scriptures, and the treatises of the fathers. Besides these, there was an indefinite number of other scribes, who wrought with equal diligence in the transcription of *other books*. Over them was a monk well versed in all kinds of knowledge, whose business it was to appoint *some good work as a task for each*, and to correct the mistakes of those who wrote negligently. In the course of time the monks wrote a great many volumes." The historian of Hirschau acknowledges that at this very time Clugni was superior to it, and no doubt had as many transcribers. Moreover, as the Abbot William thought this practice so necessary, we may be sure that he insisted on its observance in the eight monasteries which he founded, and the hundred which he reformed. Indeed, every monastery, at least of any note, contained a *Scriptorium*, or room for the scribes, where they worked in company, and at a somewhat later period, a general chapter of the Cistercian Order directed that the same silence should be observed in the Scriptorium as in the cloister. Sometimes private cells were called by the name of Scriptorium, but these were given as a special favour to persons who held a high office in the monastery, or probably to such of them as were engaged in original composition.

The reader, who will attentively consider the vast number of monks who were engaged in transcribing gratis, and the vast number of seculars, who employed themselves in the same lucrative occupation for hire; who will, moreover, remember, that every printed book has been first written with the pen, and generally more than once, will not feel much difficulty in admitting the justness of the following observation. "We come, I think, fairly to the idea," (says Maitland, p. 416.) "that although the power of multiplication at work in the Dark Ages, was infinitely below that which now exists; and even although the whole actual produce of the two periods are not to be compared, yet, as regards those books which were considered as the standard works, in sacred and secular literature, the difference was not so extreme as may have been supposed."

Whoever has read over the few extracts and quotations which have been given in this paper, will see that the old

monks were not only diligent transcribers of the works of others, but that they occasionally composed books themselves, in which, amongst many other things, they give us a very vivid picture of their own manner of life, and every day pursuits. We also see that in the very darkest period they spent a portion of their time in the study of science, and that some of them even then constructed spheres, and wrote upon mathematics. Their knowledge of the arts is attested, not only by the glorious gothic churches which they erected, but by their splendid illuminated manuscripts, the colours of which are still unfaded after the lapse of a thousand years. And certainly we have never been able to look upon one of these old manuscripts without the deepest veneration for those who wrote them. We behold a large work transcribed upon parchment, without a single blot, every letter of which is perfectly and beautifully formed. And then every page is so splendidly illustrated with those glorious capital letters which have been painted in the imperishable colours invented by the old monks, and which are still as bright as the day on which they were formed. When we add to this, that they reclaimed Europe from barrenness, that they were the founders of schools where science and religion were taught, and of hospitals where christian charity was practised; we will, if not blinded by prejudice, admit that they did not live in vain, and that they contributed their full share to the advancement of society, the preservation of religion, and the true and permanent happiness of mankind.

When these old monks took to writing books, it is but natural to suppose that religion and theology would be their most constant and fertile themes: for from the abundance of the heart the mouth speaketh. As we have just seen, they by no means neglected other branches of knowledge; but of their works on scientific and literary subjects, we shall add nothing to what we have already stated, as we have determined to devote the remainder of this paper to a brief notice of scholasticism.

Our word *School*, as well as the Latin, *Schola*, the French, *Ecole*, &c., are derived from the Greek word, *σχολη*, which signifies leisure, but was used by the more modern Greek writers, such as Plutarch, to express the same idea as its derivatives. From *σχολη*, is derived (1) *σχολαστικός*, which signified "unoccupied" according to the original meaning of the noun from which it is formed, and "addicted to

study" according to the later acceptance of the same word; and (2) the Latin *scholasticus*, which, like the substantive *Schola*, has lost the original meaning altogether, and signifies, of, or belonging to, a school or scholar.

According to Brucker, (tom. iii. p. 710.) who quotes Petronius, *Scholasticus*, first signified pupils, but was applied to teachers of Rhetoric a little before the time of Cicero.* Thus *scholasticus* had the same meaning as *σοφος*, and signified a professor of eloquence. Hence it was used to express eloquence of discourse, and St. Jerome uses it in this sense when he says of himself, that he had adorned many things with the flowers of scholasticism—*multa scholastico flore pinxisse*. The word retained this meaning in the Middle Ages, in which, whatever was most elegant in literature, was called *scholastic*. Hence, we find that Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, (A. D. 320) Socrates, who lived in the time of the younger Theodosius, Aurelius Prudentius, a sacred and noble poet—*sacer nobilisque poeta*—who flourished under the younger Theodosius,—Evagrius the historian, and many others, were called *scholastics*. Jerome also says, (*de viris Illust.*) of Sarapion, "that on account of the elegance of his genius, he deserved the surname of *scholastic*."

Charlemagne earned the name of Great, not only by his success in arms, but also by his glorious exertions in the cause of learning. In his youth he had been taught reading and grammar by Petrus Pisanus, an old deacon. When he invited the famous Englishman, Alcuin, into France, to aid him in the noble work of diffusing knowledge among his subjects, he became a pupil in the school established in the palace over which that illustrious foreigner presided, learned rhetoric, logic, astronomy, music, &c., and acquired a knowledge of the Latin and Greek languages, the former of which he spoke after he was forty years old.* He also kept in the palace, persons acquainted with the Syriac, to assist him in collating the text of the Holy Scriptures.

Two Irishmen, Clement and Albin, had also the honour

* *Deduci in scenas scholasticorum qui rhetores vocantur quos paulo ante Ciceronis tempora extitisse, &c.* Quintilion, quoted by Brucker, *ubi sup.*

† Eginhard quoted by Brucker, vol. iii., p. 589.

of assisting Charlemagne in his glorious undertaking. Of these an old monk* tells a pleasant story, which is not to be rejected as entirely false, although the facts are conveyed in a romantic narrative. He says that two Irish Scots, deeply versed in all kinds of sacred and profane learning, accompanied some British merchants to the French coast. The crowds which flocked to the ship every day were astonished that these two had no merchandize for sale, and that they cried out to all who came to purchase, "If any one is desirous of wisdom, let him come to us and receive it. We ask no money in exchange for this commodity." The people, mistaking them for madmen, reported the matter to the king, who sent for them, and was filled with great joy when he found that they were so learned. Clement he commanded to reside in France, to whose care and instruction he committed a *swarm* of boys; and the other, (Albin,) he set over the monastery of Padua, in Italy, where he established a famous school.

Assisted by these eminent persons, Charlemagne opened a great number of academies, in all parts of his vast dominions, and, moreover, says Brucker, † "earnestly exhorted the bishops to aid in the advancement of art and science, by annexing schools to the cathedral churches. This was attended with so great success, that during the reigns of Charles the Great and Louis the Pious, schools were established in most of the sees by the bishops and canons. And although the chief aim of these institutions was to teach the children of freemen and slaves, grammar, music, and arithmetic, so that the school of Osnaberg obtained from the emperor the singular privilege of comprehending Greek and Latin within its course of studies, in order that there might always be found clerics well skilled in both languages; nevertheless, it is evident, from the testimonies of contemporary writers, collected by Lannoy, that a knowledge of the liberal arts was also imparted in these schools. It is clear that, in addition to sacred learning, the other sciences, or what was called the Trivium and Quadrivium ‡ course, were explained in the episcopal and monastic

* Monachus Sangallensis, (the monk of St. Gall,) quoted by Brucker, vol. iii. p. 585.6. He wrote two books: *De Gestis Caroli Regis Francorum, et Imperatoris ad Carolum Calvum.*

† Ibid, p. 593.

‡ The Trivium included grammar, rhetoric, logic. The Quadrivium, music, arithmetic, geometry, and astronomy. This was

schools over each of which a scholastic or professor presided." The second Council of Chalons, which was celebrated by order of Charlemagne, in 813, commanded all bishops to establish schools, in which profane literature and the sacred scriptures should be taught. The person who presided in these schools was called the *Scholastic*.

That these schools continued to exercise a beneficial influence upon the clergy, even during the darkest period of the Dark Ages, may be inferred from the Pastoral Letter which Riculphus, Bishop of Soissons, addressed to the clergy of his diocese, in 889. In addition to many other matters of great importance, he orders each of them to have a Ritual to administer baptism, a Missal, a book of the Lessons, a book of the Gospels, a Martyr-book, a book of Anthems, a Psalter, and a copy of St. Gregory's forty homilies; to be able to repeat by heart, the Psalms, Canon of the Mass, Creed, the symbol *quicumque*, &c., and to be acquainted with ecclesiastical music and the Calendar. He counsels them to celebrate Mass frequently, at which they should exhort their people to be present; commands them to preach on Sundays and holidays, to instruct the Catechumens during Lent, that they may be baptised and receive the holy Eucharist at Easter; to watch over Public Penitents, and to administer to the sick the Holy Unction, after Confession and Absolution, but before Communion. He advises them to be charitable and hospitable, and commands the Deans to assemble the clergy of their districts on the first day of every month, for the purpose of holding conferences on the duties of their ministry and the necessities of their parishes. This letter, which is printed at length, (Tom. 9, Concili, at the end of Condesius' edition of Hincmar's works, Paris, 1615.) and an abstract of which will be found in Du Pin's Hist. of Ecclesiastical Writers, (cent. 9, versus finem,) will, we think, show, that even in the end of the ninth and the beginning of the tenth century, the clergy, as a body, could not have been so ignorant, dissolute, or idle as they have been represented. Nay, perhaps some of those ministers who sneer at the Dark Ages, might find in this letter

exclusive of the theological course, some idea of which may be formed from the passage of Riculphus, quoted a little further on, from the council of Chalons, and from the fact just stated, that some of them should know Greek well.

some very useful instructions, of which they would do well to avail themselves.

The method of teaching Theology has been divided into Positive and Discursive. The former relies chiefly on the exposition of the Holy Scriptures, the teaching of the Fathers, and the decrees of Popes and Councils. The latter, receiving all these with the most profound reverence and unhesitating faith, evolves them by the light of reason, and deduces from them various consertaries. It calls to its aid the subtle definitions of philosophy, makes numerous divisions, and subjects every argument to the most severe rules of dialectics. But, as true religion is founded on reason as well as on revelation, it is evident that he would be unworthy the name of theologian who did not combine both these methods. Positive theology must employ reason in establishing the divinity of our holy religion, in the interpretation of Scripture, and in explaining the writings of the Fathers, the bulls of Pontiffs, and the decrees of Councils; whilst discursive theology must build upon authority that faith which it afterwards adorns and defends by the principles of philosophy. The theology of Augustine is positive, that of Aquinas, discursive; and yet no one can use the weapons of reason more powerfully than the former, or urge the authority of the Scriptures and of the Church more felicitously than the latter. They differ, however, in this, that discursive theology makes a larger use of the principles of reason, discusses a great many subtle questions, connected sometimes as much with the speculations of metaphysics as with doctrine, and employs the terms, definitions, divisions, and artificial method of philosophy. Reason is necessary to explain and defend the faith; its artificial rules are not necessary; but when used with moderation and caution, they may be rendered as serviceable to the cause of truth, as when abused they become certainly and ruinously pernicious.

There can be no doubt that numerous and most pernicious heresies were derived, first from the writings of Plato, and afterwards from those of Aristotle. To the former, the Fathers of the Church trace the Simonians, Valentinians, Marcionites, and Manichæans, with many other wide-spread Eastern sects; and to the latter, the Arians, Ætians, and Eunomians.* Hence some of the more

* See this whole subject discussed by Petavius with his usual

ancient defenders of the faith would appear not only to have rejected the science of dialectics, which supplied its enemies with their most powerful weapons, but all kinds of profane philosophy; whilst others, restricting both within their proper limits, extracting from them what was good, and casting away what was bad, successfully combated the opponents of the Church with their own arms. And this is indeed one of the principal services which dialectics render to religion. Clement of Alexandria says, (lib. 1, Strom.) "The doctrine of our Saviour is in itself perfect, and requires not the aid of any man's philosophy, because it is the science and wisdom of God. Hence, when Greek philosophy is taken into its service, it does not render truth stronger, but by weakening the sophistical attacks which are made against it, becomes a fitting wall and rampart to guard the vineyard." "Logic is the hedge," he says, (lib. 6,) "which prevents truth from being trampled down by the sophists." Even Basil, who inveighs against Aristotle, when defending the faith against Eunomius, admits this use of dialectics in nearly the same words: "Logic," he says, (in cap. 2, Isaïæ) serves as a wall to doctrine, because it does not allow it to be torn down easily, nor leave it exposed to every sudden assault." Of Basil himself, Gregory Nazianzine says, (Orat. 20,) "that he so excelled in logical demonstrations and disputations which they call dialectics, that those who contended with him could more easily extricate themselves from a labyrinth than get out of his arguments." And, indeed, the works of Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, against Eunomius, as well as the commentaries of Cyril of Alexandria upon St. John, may be said to be a contest in dialectics with most subtle heretics, in the refutation of whose sophisms they show themselves to be admirably skilled in the art of logic. The heretics soon found that the arms of Aristotle were more powerful in the cause of truth than of error. Serapion, in

learning, tom. 1. De Dogmatibus Theologicis, Cap. 3. Both Socrates, (lib. i., cap. 5,) and Sozomen, (lib. i., c. 15,) testify that Arius was a most sharp dialectician. *Διαλεκτικώτατος* is Sozomen's expression. Of Ætius, Epiphanius says, (Hær. 76, p. 2.) that being ignorant until he became old, he at length studied Aristotle's Philosophy, at Alexandria, and that, having learned logic, he afterwards applied himself strenuously to explain the entire relation of the Divine Word by certain figures.

his contest with Arnobius, says: "You break out into a logical sophism." To which the Catholic answers, "A logical sophism has two properties: it establishes what is true, and if there be falsehood anywhere it detects it." "Throw away logic," cries the heretic. "Logic," replies the Catholic, "enters into obscure things, that what is true may be recognized for the truth." Something exactly similar happened in later times. The enemies of the Church pressed Aristotle into their service, but when her champions encountered them with their own weapons, they also discovered that logic is more formidable on the side of truth than of error, and it has been remarked of most of them, that they would as willingly encounter Satan as a syllogism.

Nor indeed were the ancient Fathers opposed to each other regarding the use of dialectics in matters connected with religion, for we find the very same persons condemning it at one time and approving of it at another. They admitted the use of logic in defending as well as in explaining the faith, but they justly reprobated the abuse of human reason as well as of dialectics, when they were set up as the judges of faith, and when nothing would be believed whose truth they had not previously established. But this perversion of reason is by no means peculiar to those who use Aristotle's philosophy; it is far oftener conveyed in the well turned periods of the rhetorician; and in a dry syllogism it is infinitely less attractive and dangerous than in the sparkling pages of Voltaire or of Gibbon. On this subject the great Augustine says (Ep. 222), "With regard, therefore, to certain things appertaining to doctrine which we are not yet able to understand by reason, although we will be able to do so at some future time, let faith, by which the heart is cleansed, go before reason, so that it may be enabled to admit and to bear the light of great reason. This certainly is reasonable. And therefore it is reasonably said by the prophet: unless ye shall believe ye shall not understand. Where without doubt he distinguished these two, and advised us to believe first, that we may be able to understand that which we believe. Therefore it is reasonable that faith should precede reason." The method pointed out here is that which has been always followed in the Catholic Church, and it certainly would be a novel charge against the theologians of the Middle Ages

to accuse them of giving too much to reason and too little to authority.

The second objection which the Fathers preferred against the Greek philosophy, and which is in a great measure peculiar to logic, is the contentiousness and the pride of triumphing even in a bad cause, which it is apt to produce, and the passion with which its abettors often debate the most trivial questions, neglecting those that are of real importance. "The science of disputation," says Augustine, (*Lib. 2. de Doct. Christ. cap. 31.*), "is very useful in enabling us to penetrate and resolve all kinds of questions that are found in the sacred writings. Only we must avoid a passion for disputation and the puerile vanity of deceiving an adversary." We confess that many of the schoolmen were not free from this fault; but it is not inherent in the science of dialectics, but a defilement that obscures its beauty, impairs its usefulness, and from which it should therefore be carefully purified.

Avoiding these faults, logic is sometimes necessary and always useful in doctrinal discussions. St. John Damascene—a Greek writer of the eighth century, who, in his four books on the orthodox faith, was the first to comprise in one treatise the whole body of Christian doctrine—thus elegantly expresses how far the science of dialectics is necessary for the Christian theologian: "Every artist," he says (*Dialog. cap. 1.*), "requires some tools for the performance of his work, and it is right that theology, which is the queen of arts, should be attended by some of her handmaids. Let us therefore receive the other sciences as the servants of truth, and free them from the tyrannous and usurped rule of impiety. And let us not use what is good for a bad purpose, nor convert the art of disputation into a means of deceiving the simple. And although truth has no need of those sophistical inventions, nevertheless we must make use of them to confute those mischievous disputants, and to refute that false-named science."

The treatise upon logic that was in most general use in the episcopal and monastic schools, in which as we have seen that science formed a regular part of the course of studies, was that which went under the name of Augustine. This great Saint says in his retractations, that he had written a treatise upon grammar, and commenced others upon logic, rhetoric, geometry, arithmetic, and philosophy, none of which were completed. He also read and easily

understood without a master* the ten categories of Aristotle. It is certain that the treatises on logic and the categories† which are found among the works of Augustine, were not composed by him, but he was believed to be the author, and this caused them to be revered in the schools.

Boethius, a writer of the fifth century, who has been rendered famous by his misfortunes as well as by his philosophy, translated and wrote commentaries on the works of Aristotle. He was born of an illustrious family about the year 455, was three times consul, an honour which he lived to see conferred upon his two sons in 522, was stripped of his possessions, banished to Pavia, and beheaded in 524 by order of Theodoric, king of the Ostrogoths, to whom he had discharged the duties of a wise and faithful minister. His treatise on the consolation of philosophy, which he composed in prison, is partly in prose and partly in verse, and is written with elegance and purity. His theological works consist of a treatise on the two natures of Jesus Christ, a treatise on the Trinity addressed to Symmachus, and a letter to John, Deacon of Rome, which treats of matters connected with the same mystery. In all these works he has made use of Aristotle's philosophy, whose definitions of substance, person, &c., he has adopted, and on this account he is very generally considered the first who used the acute subtleties of the Stagirite in explaining the doctrines of Theology. We have already had occasion to state that the philosophy of Aristotle was known to some ecclesiastics during the four following centuries, most probably by means of the translation of Boethius, and though its principles may have been very rarely and in a very limited degree used to illustrate the faith, they certainly did not take place to any considerable extent until the Saracens of Spain exchanged the sword for the syllogism. They at first disdained to use any argument but the scimitar in propagating the doctrines of their prophet. But after their fiery career had been extinguished by

* Confessionum, lib. iv. cap. xvi.

† At the end of each tome of St. Augustine's works are placed the spurious treatises connected with the subjects treated of in it. The grammar, logic, categories, and rhetoric, are at the end of the first tome.

Charles Martel, in the blood of their chief and a hundred thousand of his warriors, they assailed Christianity with other arms. Aristotle was translated into Arabic, and a vast number of Mahommedan writers commented on his works with incredible subtilty. The Christians were obliged to exercise themselves in the same kind of arms, to enable them to combat their enemies, and it is clear that Aristotle's logic was taught in some of the schools as early as the beginning of the eleventh century, since Ingulf, who was secretary to William the Conqueror, and afterwards Abbot of Croyland, speaks of it not as if it were a recent importation, but as forming a regular portion of the course of studies pursued at Oxford in his time. Hallam states, (vol. ii. chap. 9, part 2, note) on the authority of Brucker, that it was Boethius' translation of parts of Aristotle's logic which was in use at Oxford, and that it is to this Ingulf refers. This seems to us to be a pure conjecture without any foundation whatever, for it appears to be almost certain that a complete translation of Aristotle's logic and metaphysics must have existed at this time in Latin. Hermannus Contractus, the son of Count Weringen, in Livonia, was at the age of fourteen sent to the monastery of St. Gall to be educated. He was lame and *contracted* in body, and made little progress in learning on account of the slowness of his mind. Hilperic, his master, seeing how bitterly he bewailed his misfortunes, pitied him, and advised him to apply himself to prayer, and to implore the assistance of the immaculate virgin, the mother of God. Hermannus obeyed his master, and in less than two years he thought he saw the holy Virgin one night whilst he was asleep, and that she thus addressed him: "O good child, I have heard your prayers, and at your request have come to assist you. Now therefore choose whichever of these two things you please, and you shall certainly obtain it—either to have your body cured, or to become master of all the science you desire." Hermannus did not hesitate to prefer the gifts of the mind to those of the body, and such from this period was his progress in human and divine science, that he was esteemed the most learned of his contemporaries. He excelled them all in philosophy, rhetoric, astronomy, poetry, music, and theology; composed books upon geometry, music, astronomy, the eclipses of the sun and moon, the astrolabe, the quadrant, the horologue, and the quadrature of the circle;

wrote commentaries on Aristotle and Cicero, translated some Greek and Arabic volumes into Latin, composed a chronicle from the creation of the world to the year 1052, a treatise on physiognomy, and several hymns, amongst which the *Salve Regina*, *Alma Redemptoris*, and the *Veni Sancte Spiritus* are enumerated. He belongs to the earlier portion of the eleventh century, for he died in the year 1054, at the age of forty-one. And will any one believe that persons who understood the Greek and Arabic, in both which languages there were numerous copies of Aristotle's writings, and who actually translated works from both, would have left in unknown tongues an author on whom they wrote commentaries, if a perfect Latin version had not already existed? Indeed, Brucker himself (vol. iii. p. 670), on whom Hallam relies, expressly says that the story of Hermannus proves the falsehood of the assertion that Aristotle was first translated into Latin in the twelfth century. We think there can be no doubt but that there existed a complete Latin version of Aristotle as early as the year 1000, and that it was made not from the Greek but from the Arabic. Not to enter into the internal evidence upon this point, which is quite decisive, it may be sufficient to observe that the intercourse between the Christians and the Saracens of Spain who esteemed Aristotle highly, was so intimate, that many copies of the Arabic version must have fallen into their hands, and that their attention must have necessarily been directed to a work from which their enemies derived almost all the objections which they urged against the holy religion which they professed. Consequently Aristotle's logic and metaphysics began to be taught in the commencement of the eleventh century, in the episcopal and monastic schools, and in a short time it formed a part of the regular course of ecclesiastical studies. Other causes, which we shall explain just now, contributed to accelerate the revolution which was taking place in favour of Aristotle, so that before the end of the century the study of his philosophy and its application to the science of divinity had become so universal in the schools, that this mode of teaching theology was emphatically called the *Scholastic* method, and those who adopted it *Scholastics*, or schoolmen.*

* (Brucker, vol. iii. p. 675.) He says, that this kind of philosophy which began to prevail in the schools from the middle of the

The same philosophical subtleties which were urged by the Mahomedans against the Christian religion, were in the eleventh century used by the Greeks to impugn the Catholic dogma of the procession of the Holy Ghost. Nor were there wanting in the West during this same period, men who endeavoured by the aid of the philosophy of Aristotle to justify their rebellion against the Church. Berenger, Archdeacon of Angers, who was born at Tours about the year 1000, undertook to prove that our Lord is not really present in the Holy Eucharist, by metaphysical quibbles derived from this new-fangled philosophy. Even Sigebert of Gemblours,* the violent partisan of Henry IV. against St. Gregory VII. distinctly charges Berenger with obscuring or destroying the faith by his subtleties. He says that "he was a distinguished dialectician, and that by abusing philosophical sophisms to destroy the simplicity of the Apostolic faith, he perverts what is clear rather than elucidates what is obscure." Guitmond, who was bishop of Avern; about the year 1080, brings the same charges against Berenger, in reply to whom he has written three books on the Eucharist. All those who have examined this matter, although most unfriendly to scholastic theology, are forced to admit that the heretics, and especially Berengarius and his followers, obliged the schoolmen to prepare themselves to defend the Church by exercising themselves in the disputations of Aristotle. "All confess," says a bitter enemy of the schools, "that this kind of theology had its origin in an over-curious reading of the doctrine of Aristotle, which, as Bede declares, was formerly quite a stranger to the schools. But in this century, and principally on the occasion of the Berengarian controversies, meddling persons, and for the most part such as favoured or seemed to favour Berengarius, introduced the dialectics of Aristotle into the schools. Whence it happened that those were looked upon as heretics who first used the newly imported terms and refinements of this philosophy in the scholastic exercises.†

eleventh century, was called scholastic, because it crept abroad out of the monasteries and cathedral schools. "Eo quod ex scholis cathedralium et monasteriorum prorepserit.

* Quoted by Brucker, *ibid.* p. 660.

† Caesar Egassius Bulaeus, tome i. *Hist. Univ. Par. Cet.* iii. apud Gener. p. 4.

When the most sublime mysteries of faith were thus submitted to the judgment of reason, it was not to be expected that the doctrine of the Trinity, any more than that of the Eucharist, would escape its quibbles. Hence we cannot be surprised when we find that before the end of the same century, Roscelin, a priest of Campiegne, a famous dialectician, and the leader of the *nominalists*, advanced doctrines inconsistent with this great mystery. Modern protestants who almost instinctively take under their protection all heretics, including even those who reject what they are pleased to consider fundamental articles of faith, have of course endeavoured to defend Roscelin. With them his condemnation by the Catholic Church is a patent of orthodoxy. But Brucker himself (vol. iii. p. 673), admits that "he profanes the simplicity of this tremendous mystery, by the introduction of strange notions and vain meaningless abstractions."

In the year 1079 was born of a noble family, at the village of Palais, near Nantes, Peter Abelard; a man whose adventures are so singular, and at the same time so inseparably interwoven with the triumphs and the errors which were occasioned by scholastic pursuits, that it would be unpardonable to pass him by without notice. Although the oldest son, he abandoned his birthright to his brothers in order that he might be able to devote himself entirely to the study of logic and metaphysics. For this purpose he left his native country, and after visiting several schools during his journey at length came to Paris and placed himself under William of Champeaux, Archdeacon of Notre Dame, and the most famous dialectician of his time. At first he lived on very friendly terms with his master and school-fellows, but his vanity soon led him to dispute the opinions of the former; and the tone of arrogant superiority which he assumed over the latter rendered him extremely odious to the entire school. He therefore left Paris and opened a school of his own not far from that city, at the royal castle of Melun, where he obtained a license to teach publicly. He afterwards removed to Corbeil, which is still nearer Paris, with the hope of eclipsing the fame of William of Champeaux and attracting his scholars to himself. Being obliged to go home on account of ill health, which had been induced by intense application, he found on his return that William had become regular canon in the Church of St. Victor, where he con-

tinued his lectures, and he again enrolled himself among his pupils for the purpose of studying rhetoric. But he soon renewed his old metaphysical disputes with his master, especially concerning the universal *a parti rei*, which he urged so successfully that he forced him to change his opinions. This gained him such reputation that the person who had succeeded William in the school of Paris was not ashamed to surrender his chair to him, and to place himself under him for instruction. But William soon resumed the school of Paris, and Abelard went to St. Genevieve, where he continued to lecture publicly. When his father became a monk and his mother also retired from the cares of her family to lead a religious life, he was again obliged to break up his school and go home to his own country. Finding on his return to Paris that William had been made bishop of Chalons, he went thither for the purpose of studying divinity under Anslem, Canon and Dean of Laon. But as usual he soon exchanged the character of pupil for that of master, and expounded the scriptures with great applause, and very probably not without great errors. His lectures being on this account interdicted by his master, he returned to Paris, where he resumed his exposition of the Holy Scriptures. It was at this time he became acquainted with Heloise, a young lady of great beauty, and niece to Fulbert, canon of Paris. Abelard became her tutor, and employed baseness and falsehood to effect her ruin. He persuaded her uncle to take him to board in his house under what he declares to have been the false pretence of devoting more time to her instruction. As soon as his conduct was discovered he was turned out of doors, but he induced Heloise to abandon her uncle's house disguised in the habit of a nun, and to accompany him to his own country, where their son Astrolabe was born. To pacify her uncle Abelard married her privately in Paris, after which they met very seldom, and then in secret. Her relations, as was to be expected, divulged the marriage, but Heloise at the instigation of her husband, or actuated by a noble but mistaken self-sacrifice, denied it, lest by its acknowledgement she should injure his interests. Abelard was ungenerous enough, in order more effectually to impose upon the public, to ask her to assume the habit of a nun, without, however, taking the vows, in the monastery of Argenteuil. This new injury enraged her relations to such a

degree, that they entered his chamber by force and reduced him to the degrading condition of an eunuch. Nothing could exceed the shame and confusion of Abelard. He sent Heloise to Argentueil, and hid himself in the Abbey of St. Denis, and both made their religious profession on the same day. He was at length prevailed upon to resume once more his lectures upon the liberal arts as well as theology, and it is reported that the number of his pupils amounted to three thousand.

His treatises regarding the unity of God and the Trinity were declared by many persons to be full of errors. Abelard was cited to the Council of Soissons, in 1121, where his writings were condemned, and he was himself sentenced to be confined during his life in a monastery. He cast his book into the fire with his own hand, and recited the Athanasian Creed as a profession of his orthodoxy. He was treated with great kindness by the monks of the abbey of St. Medard, of Soissons, where he was confined. After a few days he was liberated by the Pope's legate, and allowed to return to his own monastery. But having, with his usual fortune, rendered himself odious there, he fled to Provence; and by the liberality of some private persons, and with the approbation of the bishop, was enabled to build a Chapel in a solitude near Troyes. To this place he was followed by a great number of his pupils, who furnished him with necessaries, and built cells for themselves, so that they appeared more like hermits than pupils. They also built a Church, which was dedicated to the Holy Trinity, and to which Abelard gave the name of Paraclete. When the abbot of St. Denis took from the nuns, of whom Heloise was prioress, the abbey of Argentueil, Abelard gave them the Church of the Paraclete, and its dependencies, whither he often returned to assist them in their necessities. This donation was confirmed by the bishop of Troyes, and Pope Innocent II., and in a short time the convent was richly endowed by the liberality of the faithful. It was from this place that Heloise wrote her three famous letters to Abelard, which, with his replies, are still extant. There is nothing in the genuine correspondence unbecoming persons who had devoted themselves to God. But a vast number of spurious letters have been circulated under their names, which are full of false sentiment, and are by no means free, even from obscenity. The exquisite poem

which Pope has founded on their correspondence, has rendered the names of Heloise and Abelard famous wherever the English language is understood.

Abelard still continued to propagate his errors so notoriously in his lectures and writings, that William, abbot of St. Thierry, wrote to St. Bernard, the celebrated abbot of Clairvaux, to get him condemned. When St. Bernard had read Abelard's book, and convinced himself that he had certainly advanced the errors of which he was accused, he wrote to him privately, and charitably admonished him to retract them. But this only exasperated the proud spirit of Abelard, who challenged St. Bernard to meet him, for the purpose of discussing their differences, and having them decided by the Council, which was about to assemble at Sens. St. Bernard did attend, not without great reluctance; "but," says one of Abelard's apologists,* "he had recourse to shifts, and would not answer expressly, though he had leave to do it, had very favourable judges, and was in a place where he needed not to fear anything." He appealed to the Pope, from the very tribunal which he had himself selected, and which therefore only condemned his opinions, without passing any sentence upon his person. Innocent II. confirmed the decrees of the Council, and imposed perpetual silence on Abelard himself as an heretic. The latter having published an apology for his writings, set out on his journey to Rome, to defend himself before the holy Father in person. But when he arrived at Clugny, he was detained there by the abbot, Peter the Venerable, who reconciled him to St. Bernard, and persuaded him to strike out of his writings anything offensive to Catholics which was contained in them.

Abelard at length found in Clugny that contentment and happiness which he had sought in vain in the indulgence of his passions, the enthusiastic admiration of numerous scholars, and the applause of mankind. He lived here near two years in great humility and holiness, but becoming very infirm, was removed to the more healthful and pleasant monastery of St. Marcellus, on the Seine, where he died in 1142, being the sixty-third year of his age. In his answer to the first letter from Heloise,

* Du Pin. See his History of Abelard amongst the writers of the 12th century.

Abelard had expressed a desire to be buried in the monastery of the Paraclete, that she and her nuns might pray for the repose of his soul. Peter the Venerable acquainted her of his death by a letter, in which he praises his manner of living ever since he had joined their society, and adds an epitaph to be put over his tomb. He also had his body conveyed to the Paraclete, to be interred there, and afterwards visited that monastery, where he said Mass, delivered an exhortation to the religious in the chapter-house, administered to them the Holy Eucharist, and promised Heloise to have prayers offered up for her for thirty days together after her death. She thanked him for all these favours in a letter full of tenderness and gratitude.

Of Abelard the apologist above quoted acknowledges* that "some of his propositions were insufferable, his explications of Scripture intolerable; that his way of speaking, and explanations of the mysteries, was novel; that he relied too much on his own reasoning, and was fond of prying too curiously into incomprehensible doctrines." Indeed, any one who will take the trouble of reading even a small portion of his theological works, must acknowledge that they are filled with abstruse and unintelligible metaphysical subtilties, and that St. Bernard's charge is not without a legitimate foundation—that "he disputed in such a manner as to betray himself to be an Arian when he treated of the Trinity, a Pelagian when he treated of Grace, and a Nestorian when he treated of the person of Christ." It is not a little remarkable that the most vehement assailants of the schoolmen are the defenders of Abelard, who did more to advance scholasticism than any of his contemporaries. Perhaps not one of his eulogists has ever read a line of his writings, except possibly his letters to Heloise; and he certainly owes the tenderness with which his memory has been treated, to his errors and his amours, neither of which, we should imagine, can be considered very honourable to him. Indeed, his theological writings are perhaps the most subtle that were ever produced by any schoolman; and one of his letters is written against those who condemn the use of logic. He says they remind him of the fable of the fox and the

* Du Pin, ubi sup.

grapes, and that they despise logic because they have not the genius to comprehend it. Nor can his letters be compared with those of Heloise, which are far more beautiful. She was not much inferior to him even in learning, for she understood Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, was well acquainted with theology, and could interpret the most difficult texts of sacred Scripture. She attained just the same age (63) as Abelard, when she died, on the 17th of May, 1164. She was consequently twenty-two years his junior, and survived him as many years.

In the early part of the eleventh century, Peter de Bruis and his followers produced many subtle paradoxes against the sacraments, and towards the middle of it, Gilbert de la Porrée, bishop of Poitiers, misled by the same overacute refinements of philosophy regarding the sublime mystery of the Trinity which had deceived Abelard, advanced doctrines that were inconsistent with the persons and attributes of the Deity. But above all, the Manichæan heresy appeared in the west during this century, and early in the twelfth had extensive followers in most of the continental countries. The Paulicians had revived and propagated this heresy in Armenia during the eighth and ninth centuries. They ascribed the creation of the world to an evil spirit, whom they supposed to be the author of the Old Testament, which they consequently rejected, and denied the reality of the death and resurrection of our Lord, because they believed that his body was not mortal, but impassive and celestial. Being driven out of their own country, they took refuge in Bulgaria, whence they promulgated their errors over the western Church. As early as the year 1007, some heretics were burned at Lyons for teaching Manichæan doctrines, and in the early part of the following century we find them spread over a great part of France, Germany, and Italy. It may be worth while to extract a brief outline of their doctrine from a tract regarding the Cathari, or Manichæans of Italy, written by one of their teachers at Milan after his conversion.*

They all believed that it was the devil who arranged the elements, but whether he made them or not was an open

* This tract has been published by Father Dachery, (*Spicilegium*, Tom. xii. An abstract of it will be found in Du Pin's *Hist. of the Heretics of the 12th cent.*

question;—that it was he who made Adam's body, and Eve, of whom he begat Cain;—that the fruit which Adam was forbid to eat, was the carnal knowledge of Eve;—that all bodies in the air, earth, or water, were made by the devil;—that he appeared to the Patriarchs, and is the god of the Old Testament;—that Christ had not a real body, and consequently, died and rose again in appearance only;—that he is not equal to the Father;—that the cross is the mark of the beast, and St. Sylvester Antichrist, since whose pontificate the Church has been extinct;—that no one can be saved in the married state;—that it is unlawful to eat flesh, eggs, milk, or any thing else that proceeds from animals;—and that the sun is the devil, and the moon Eve, who bear to each other the relation of man and wife, and visit once a month.

It will be observed, that the errors regarding the cross and the Pope, which are still popular, are here placed in excellent company. Indeed, the Waldenses, to whom Protestant writers are not ashamed to trace the origin of their sect, were certainly Manichæans,* although we do not mean to assert that they were orthodox believers in every article of the diabolical creed which we have just recited. But, however, intuitively absurd this doctrine may appear, it is founded on the great mystery of the existence of evil, to explain which they endeavoured, with the most acute metaphysical subtleties, to prove the necessity of two supreme beings, one infinitely good, and the other infinitely wicked.

The champions of the Church were obliged to study the logic and metaphysics of Aristotle, in order to be able to refute these numerous heretics. Amongst the earliest and most successful cultivators of this science in the western Church, were Lanfranc and Anselm, the celebrated Archbishops of Canterbury, who opposed and refuted Berenger and Roscelin. St. Bernard, indeed, alarmed by the errors of Abelard and others, stoutly opposed himself to the new philosophy, and gloried in his ignorance of it; and the Popes issued several instructions to moderate its use in the schools. But all opposition was now vain, and, indeed, we can hardly conceive the universal passion for this kind of study which existed at this period. The cloister had more numerous and far more enthusiastic knights-errant

* See this proved by Hallam, vol. II. cap. ix. part 2. note 4.

than the camp. We have seen that the disciples of Abelard built huts round his dwelling in the wilderness, in which they lived like hermits. The name of a celebrated master was sufficient, in spite of the delays and dangers of the journey, to attract crowds of students from the most distant countries of Europe. Learning was rewarded with fame, riches, and honors, and, as a natural consequence, so many set themselves up for masters, that an order was made in the twelfth century, that none should teach without the license of an official, who was called the Scholastic of the diocese.

Paris was at this time the most celebrated theological school in the world, and amongst those attracted to it by its fame, was Peter Lombard, who was born in a village near Novara, in Lombardy, to which circumstance he owes his surname. He brought with him a letter of introduction from the Bishop of Lucca to St. Bernard, who provided him with all necessities so long as he resided at Rheims, and on his departure for Paris, wrote to the abbot of St. Victor to entertain him gratis. In Paris, he acquired so great a reputation, that he was appointed, first professor of divinity, and afterwards bishop of that city. When the see became vacant, Philip, Archdeacon of Paris, son of Louis the Gross, was elected by the chapter, but he, although the son and brother of a king, nobly resigned this exalted dignity to an obscure but learned foreigner, who had taught him philosophy and theology. Peter Lombard took possession of his See in 1159, and died in 1164. He wrote commentaries on the Psalms, and on St. Paul's Epistles, and composed the *Four Books of Sentences*. To call the last-named work famous, is saying little; for it undoubtedly continued for nearly four centuries, one of the most celebrated books that was ever written by mortal man. It was the Iliad of the schools, and its annotators and commentators were incomparably more numerous than those who have employed themselves in the illustration of any other human production.*

* About this time academical degrees were introduced by the university of Paris. The original degree was that of licentiate. It was in fact simply a substitute for the license of the scholastic of the diocese, without which no one was allowed to teach philosophy or theology, even in the *private* schools of the monasteries. Afterwards the degree of master or doctor (which were originally

This work of Peter Lombard's is a compendious treatise upon the entire of Theology. He called it a book of *sentences*, because it is chiefly made up of quotations or sentences from the Sacred Scriptures, and the most esteemed Fathers of the Church. "The chief design,"

identical) was added, to be conferred as the reward of superior merit. In conferring this degree, *bacillus*, a word was used from which *baccalureus* (a bachelor) is derived. This soon became the name of a separate degree, which was lower than that of licentiate. Persons were still licensed to teach in private schools without the university degrees, although many of these teachers had in fact obtained them. But no public school could be opened except by a person who had obtained his degrees, and hence it often happened that candidates for degrees had taught for many years in private schools. At present this does not appear strange, but it must be remembered that at the time of which we write, degrees were in no case looked upon as a mere honour, and that they were never conferred except upon persons who were destined for the profession of teaching, of whose fitness they were a public and authentic testimony. The degrees were three in number, bachelor, licentiate, and master or doctor. The candidates for these honours must have been trained from their earliest youth in the private schools. Some persons (see de Rubéis dissertatio de commentariis S. Thomæ in Sententias, cap. i. nu. 2 et 3) say that academical degrees owe their origin to Gratian, a monk of Bononia, and author of the famous decree which bears his name, and to Peter Lombard. However this may be, the studies to which the candidates were subjected produced countless commentators on the works of the latter. No secular was permitted even to aspire to degrees who had not completed his university course, both in philosophy and theology. He was then subjected to several rigorous examinations, and if he passed through these successfully, he became a bachelor. The religious orders had the privilege of presenting one selected from their entire body each year to the university, from which he received the degree of bachelor. The licentiate entered the school of some master, under whose care and direction he explained the *Sentences* of Peter Lombard (for many other authors had written works with this title) publicly, during an entire year. At the expiration of the year, the master under whose inspection he had been placed, some other masters, and the prior of the Jacobite college, presented him to the Chancellor of the university, affirming upon oath that they considered him fit to receive the degree of *licentiate*, which would entitle him to teach as a master. As soon as he received his *license* he delivered his inaugural lecture in the episcopal palace, in the presence of the entire theological faculty. Hence he was said, *Aulam suam habere*. Here he received his *rod*, and was

says Gener, (Hist. Schol. Prodrom. 1, cap. 1,) "which Lombard had in view, was to whet the genius of the orthodox, so that they might be able to refute the numerous errors which at that time assailed the venerable dogmas of the faith with sharp and subtle disputations, as the author himself expressly declares in his preface." The *master* explains the plan of his work with his usual brevity, clearness, and precision. He begins by stating, that having again and again studied the sacred pages under the guidance of preventing grace, he had come to the conclusion, with Augustine, (Lib. de Doct. Christ.) that all knowledge regards either *Things* or *Signs*. All signs are indeed things also, but because they are primarily intended to signify something distinct from themselves, he calls them signs, in contradistinction to things. The latter he divides into, things that are to be enjoyed, things that are to be used, and things that are to use and to enjoy. The thing to be enjoyed, is that by loving and possessing which we are made happy; and this is nothing else but the Holy and Undivided Trinity,—Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. The things to be used, are those which assist us in our efforts to know, to love, and finally, to obtain possession of God. These things are, this world and the creatures which it contains. As St. Augustine says, (ubi. sup. cap. 4,) "we must not enjoy but use this world," that the invisible

declared master. He was then entitled to open a school of his own, in which he was obliged during another year to lecture on the sentences. These lectures, although spoken in the schools, were always written beforehand with great care, and accurately committed to memory. The preparation for them required, constant study of the scriptures, of the fathers, and of philosophy. The students were obliged to write them during their delivery. These writings were called *Reportata*. After the expiration of a year he was entitled to have a bachelor under him to lecture on the sentences, and was at liberty to teach what he pleased himself. Another year having elapsed, he became a *Magister emeritus* or *doctor*, and was qualified to preside in the monastic schools, and even in the public schools of Paris. For more extensive information on this interesting subject, see Du Cange's *Glossarium Mediæ et Infimæ Latinitatis*, at the word *Bacchalararius* *Licentia*, Doctor Echard's (not the English historian of this name, but the French Dominican) *Bibliothèque of Dominican writers*, in his lives of Ægidius, Albertus Magnus, and St. Thomas Aquinas, and De Rubeis *Dissertatio de Commentariis S. Thomæ in Sententias*.

things of God may be clearly seen from the creation of the world, (Rom. i. 20.); that is, that by temporal things we may understand the eternal. Lastly, angels and men are the things which have the use of creatures, and are destined to enjoy of God. In accordance with this partition of knowledge, the Master divided his work into four books, in the three first of which he treats of things and in the last of signs. Each book is divided into distinctions, and the distinctions into paragraphs, and even the most intricate and perplexing subjects are discussed with admirable order and perspicuity.

In the first book, which treats of the thing to be enjoyed, he proves the Holy Trinity from Scripture and tradition, and from the same sources illustrates the attributes and providence of God. In the second book, which treats both of things to be used and of things which are to use creatures and to enjoy God—that is, angels and men—he continues the history of the creation, refutes the Manichean doctrine regarding the existence of two supreme beings, discusses the fall of the angels and of man, proves that an angel-guardian is assigned to each of us, explains the nature of original and actual sin, of grace and free-will, and handles with great power and acuteness a vast number of questions connected with these delicate subjects. In the third book, he continues to treat of things which are to use and to enjoy, and having in the second detailed the fall of man, he now proceeds to examine the manner in which his redemption was effected by the Incarnation of Jesus Christ. In the end of the book he explains, faith, hope, and charity, the cardinal virtues, and the precepts of the decalogue. In the fourth book, which regards signs, he unfolds the nature and efficacy of the holy sacraments. He observes that sacramental signs are of two kinds: some whose entire use is to signify and not to justify; such were the sacraments of the old law. Others, which not only signify, but confer grace, and such are the evangelical sacraments. In the eleventh distinction he proves that the change in the Eucharist is substantial, so that the body and blood of Jesus Christ are under the accidents that before covered the substance of bread and wine, which is now annihilated or returned to the first matter. In the following distinction he declares that the accidents remain without a subject, and that *they only* are broken and divided into parts. In this book he also treats of the

celibacy of the clergy, prayers for the dead, and of the invocation and intercession of saints.

Peter Lombard was not infallible any more than Cyprian and many other great lights of the Church. He has not been followed in every thing by his commentators. But in some things he seems to have been misunderstood, and at all events his errors are few, and for the most part not very important. Books consisting of sentences taken from the scriptures and the fathers, and arranged according to the order of the doctrines which they proved, had been composed long before the time of Lombard. So early as the seventh century, Samuel Taju, bishop of Cæsar Augusta, in Arragon, wrote a theology in "five books of sentences."^{*} And not to speak of John Damascene and others who wrote similar works, but with different titles, Hildebert composed a book of sentences in the eleventh century, and Peter Abelard, who had been Lombard's master, compiled a book with the same title in the beginning of the twelfth.† But all these minor lights, as well as many others which appeared contemporaneously with himself, were instantly lost in the blaze of his reputation, and his book appropriated to itself the name of *the* book of sentences. Professorships for the explanation of the master were established in Paris and Oxford, which were filled with the most illustrious men of their times.

Amongst the most distinguished scholastics who flourished during the twelfth century—or as it was generally designated in the schools, the first scholastic age—may be mentioned Robert de Melun, bishop of Hereford, and Cardinal Pullus or Pullen, an Englishman, who, like Peter Lombard, wrote a book of sentences, which he divided into eight parts. The subjects and order of treating them are nearly the same as in Lombard's work. He adds, however, some new matters of importance, such as that the soul is immediately created by God at the moment

^{*} Libri v. Sententiarum Theologicarum. See Mabillon *Etudes Monastiques*, part ii. cap. 6.

† This caused some persons to accuse Lombard of having stolen his book of sentences from others, but he is triumphantly vindicated by Oudin, *Commentarius de Scriptoribus Ecclesiasticis*, Tom. ii. Ad. Ann. 1140 page, with me 1218, and following, Leipsic edition, 1722.

when it is united to the body. He also makes larger use of the arguments derived from reason, but such as are always clear and pertinent. Having studied in Paris, he returned to England and restored the school of Oxford in 1133. This had been a flourishing academy in the reign of Edward the Confessor, but seems to have been deserted or neglected for nearly a century afterwards. It was revived by Pullen in the last years of the reign of Henry I. Very soon afterwards Vervinus read lectures in it during the reign of Stephen. It continued to flourish during the subsequent reigns, so that when John ascended the throne (1199), it contained three thousand students. A charter was granted to it by that prince early in the following century. Although Pullen was appointed archdeacon of Rochester, he returned to Paris, and resumed his office of professor of scholastic divinity. He was the intimate friend of St. Bernard. Being invited to Rome by Innocent II., he was created Cardinal by Lucius II. in 1144. He died in 1150, in the pontificate of Eugene III.

The history of another English Cardinal, whose scholastic career belongs to this century, is too well known to be detailed in this place. We mean Stephen Langton, whose name is indissolubly connected with the great charter of our liberties. He studied in the university of Paris, in which he successively held, with the highest reputation, the offices of professor of scripture, of divinity, and of Chancellor.

A vast number of scholastic writers and teachers appeared in the thirteenth century--the second age of scholasticism; and in spite of the sneers of the ignorant, the narrow-minded, and the bigoted, we venture to call many of them great and enlightened men; the very standard-bearers in the onward progress of mind; whose motto was ever, "forward; who laboured all their life long with unwearied zeal in the pursuit of knowledge, and who therefore deserved and obtained a world-wide renown. Amongst these we are proud to name two Englishmen; Alexander of Hales, who professed philosophy and theology in Paris, and by order of Innocent IV., wrote a commentary on the sentences, and Roger Bacon, whose intellect being sharpened by scholastic disputations, penetrated the mysteries of nature, and pointed out the way to those glorious discoveries, with which in a later age

Newton and Leibnitz dazzled the world. He made great proficiency in mathematics, mechanics, and chemistry, and was so well skilled in astronomy that he proposed to Clement IV. to undertake the correction of the Calender. In his *Specula Mathematica et Perspectiva*, he tries to resolve several problems regarding the *foci* of spherical mirrors and burning glasses, treats of the refraction and apparent magnitude of the stars, and of other matters which greatly advanced the knowledge of optics; and was not altogether unacquainted with the principles on which glasses, telescopes, and microscopes, were afterwards constructed. He was acquainted with the effects which saltpetre is capable of producing, on which account some persons attributed to him the invention of gunpowder. But this discovery more probably belongs to Schwartz, another Franciscan friar, who was also the contemporary of Bacon.

Albert the Great (Albertus Magnus) illustrious by his descent from the Lords of Bolstadt, and still more illustrious on account of his virtues and learning, was born at Lavingin in Suabia, in 1205, and at the age of eighteen entered the order of St. Dominic. He at first succeeded so badly in his studies, that he resolved to leave the monastery. One night he fancied in his sleep that he had placed a ladder against the wall for the purpose of making his escape, but when he reached the top he beheld four matrons, one of whom united the greatest dignity with the most dazzling and enchanting beauty. As he was about to leap down from the wall, one of them approached and pushed him back into the monastery. A second attempt resulted in the same manner, and as he was about to make a third, one of them asked him why he wished to leave the order. He replied that he was ashamed of his ignorance. Upon which one of the matrons pointing to the blessed Virgin, said, "Behold the Mother of God and Queen of heaven: recommend yourself to her and she will obtain from her Son what you require." Having said this, she presented him to the blessed Virgin, who promised that he should become learned and famous, "but," she added, "upon a certain time, whilst you shall be lecturing in the public chair, you shall forget on a sudden all your learning." He soon after, as this vision foretold, eclipsed all his competitors in the knowledge of sacred scripture, theology, and philosophy. He, like Roger

Bacon, was fully acquainted with Euclid, on whom, as well as on Aristotle, and the master of the sentences, he wrote commentaries, and, like the English philosopher, he had made great progress in mixed mathematics.* Being an accomplished linguist, he made himself master of Latin, Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Ægyptian philosophy, from which we may infer that he was not ignorant of algebra, which was known to some Italians as early as the commencement of the thirteenth century. He spent his life in teaching philosophy and theology with great renown in Cologne and in Paris, with the exception of two years, during which he had been reluctantly compelled by Alexander IV. to bear the weight of the dignity of bishop of Ratisbon. But he gladly retired to his convent and his chair, which he continued to fill until within three years of his death, when in the course of a public lecture which he was delivering to a numerous audience at Cologne, all his science suddenly deserted him. Having related the story of the apparition of the mother of God, he took leave of his pupils, and devoted the remainder of his life exclusively to prayer and meditation. He died on the 15th November, 1280, at the very time when St. Thomas was lecturing in Paris; he, it is related, suddenly stopped the lecture and exclaimed, "Albertus, my master, is dead."

Amongst those who attended the lectures of Albertus Magnus, both in Cologne and in Paris, was Thomas de Aquinas, son of the count of that name, grand nephew of the Emperor Frederick I., and nearly related to Henry VI., and Frederick II. He might, with equal justice, have been called the hero, and the angel of the schools.† Placed by his father, in 1232, when he was only five years old, under the care of the monks of St. Cassino, he imbibed that affection for a religious life which enabled him, in its pursuit, to triumph over almost insurmountable difficulties,

* See Aventinus, *Annales Boiorum*, quoted by Natalis Alexander *Hist. Ecc. in Scriptores Sæculi*, in *vita Alberti Magni*, xiii.

† It was the custom of that age to confer some such epithet on the most distinguished teachers. Thus Alexander of Hales was called *Doctor Irrefragabilis*, Roger Bacon *Doctor Admirabilis*, St. Bonaventure *Doctor Seraphicus*, St. Thomas *Doctor Angelicus*, Scotus *Doctor Sublimis*, &c. Friar Gerund is very witty on this subject.

and that love of virtue which preserved his innocence in the midst of licentiousness. So rapid was his progress in learning, at this place, that, by the advice of the abbot, he was sent to the University of Naples when only eleven years old. The attendance at this University, which Frederick II. had established in opposition to Bologna, in 1224, was very large, because that emperor had commanded that students should resort to no other in Italy. In this place St. Thomas studied rhetoric under Peter Martin, and philosophy under Peter of Ireland, (*Petrus Hibernius*.) in both which sciences he made wonderful progress. The disorders into which he saw young men of the world fall at the University, made him still more anxious to secure himself from temptation within the walls of a monastery; and he accordingly took the habit in the Dominican convent at Naples, in 1234, being then in the seventeenth year of his age. The countess Theodora, his mother, immediately set out to Naples, to force him to return to the world; but he fled to Rome, and not considering himself secure from her pursuit in this place, set out for Paris, but was intercepted during his journey by his two brothers, who endeavoured to pull off his habit; and not being able to effect this, they carried him in it to the seat of their parents, at Rocca-Secca. Neither the tears and entreaties, nor the reproaches of his mother and sisters, nor close confinement, could shake his resolution. His brothers, who were officers in the Emperor's army, determined to conquer him by violence. They tore the habit off his back, shut him up in a tower, and introduced a beautiful courtesan into his chamber, promising her great rewards if she could induce him to sin. But none of these attempts could shake the resolution of Thomas. The year of his confinement passed swiftly, at first in heavenly meditations alone, and afterwards in studying the Bible, Aristotle's Logic, and the works of the Master of the Sentences, which his sisters, pitying his lonely condition, had given to him; and the courtesan he chased with a burning brand from his chamber. Both Innocent IV. and the Emperor remonstrated against his confinement, and the Dominicans of Naples being informed that the countess would connive at her son's escape, some of them came in disguise to Rocca-Secca, into whose arms he was let down in a basket by his sister. In the following year he made his profession in that convent. He resumed

his studies under Albertus Magnus, at Cologne; and so great was his humility, that he concealed his proficiency from his fellow-students, by whom he was called the Dumb Ox. But his master, who had penetrated the depths of his genius, told them "that this Dumb Ox would one day give a bellow that would be heard over the whole world."

Amongst the fellow-students of St. Thomas at Paris was St. Bonaventure,* who, in his twenty-second year, (1245,) received the habit of St. Francis, in the province of Rome, from the hands of Haymo, an Englishman, who was at that time general of the order. Bonaventure was of so sweet a disposition, that his master, Alexander of Hales, said of him, that he "seemed not to have sinned in Adam." He was also so eminent a scholar, that he and St. Thomas were invited by the University of Paris, to take the doctor's cap together. A generous contest took place between them, each insisting that the other should take precedence; but at length St. Bonaventure prevailed, and thus, as it has been happily expressed, triumphed at the same time over his friend and himself. Both these saints professed theology, wrote commentaries on a large portion of the sacred Scriptures, and on the Master of Sentences, and composed numerous other theological treatises. The works of St. Thomas were printed at Venice, in 1490, in nineteen folio volumes; those of St. Bonaventure were not so voluminous, having been issued from the Roman press, in 1588, in eight folios.

The extent of the writings of St. Thomas must be regarded as truly prodigious, when we remember that he was only fifty years old when he died. Nor did he write anything for which he had not prepared himself by study and meditation. Aristotle, whom Tertullian calls the Patriarch of Heretics, had been so long allied with infidelity, and had led some of the first Christians, who had applied themselves to his study, into so many errors, that he was still dreaded by the friends of the Church, and his works were proscribed by the Council of Paris, in 1209. But St. Thomas purified him from his errors, converted

* His original name was John, but being very ill in his childhood, he was restored to health by the prayers of St. Francis of Assysium, who, when he saw the boy afterwards growing up in virtue, exclaimed, *O buona ventura*, (good fortune,) by which name the Saint was ever afterwards known.

him to Christianity, made him the champion of truth, and the obedient child of the Church.* In his metaphysical speculations St. Thomas is everywhere exact, original, and profound. He established the principles of Natural Theology by abstract reasoning; and we venture to affirm that there is not one convincing argument of this kind in favour of the existence, the attributes, and the providence of God, the germ of which will not be found in that admirable, concise, and masterly body of theology which is called his Summ. † Many persons imagine that

* It is evident from St. Thomas's writing that he had only a bad Latin translation of Aristotle. And yet a translation had been made from the Greek before his time, as appears by the following passage, which is cited by Brucker, vol. iii. p. 672: "In illis diebus" ait Rigardus citatus a Launoio de varia fortuna Aristotelis in Acad. Paris, "anno 1209, legebantur Parisiis libelli quidam de Aristotele, ut direbantur, compositi, qui docebant metaphysicam, delati de novo a Constantinopoli, et a Græco in Latinam translati." It is a very great mistake to suppose that Aristotle was blindly followed by St. Thomas, or any other of the distinguished schoolmen. They, on the contrary, pointed out his errors, and refuted them. A distinguished monkish writer of the twelfth century, after censuring the revilers of Aristotle, proceeds as follows: "not that Aristotle always either thought or wrote so as to render whatever he thought or wrote inviolable, for the light of reason, as well as the authority of faith, prove that he erred." Having pointed out many gross errors in his metaphysics and ethics, he continues thus: "Many other errors of his are enumerated by Pagan and Christian writers; but I have never read that he had an equal in logic. Hence he should be used in preparing youth for the study of more important philosophy as a teacher, not of morals, but of reasoning." John of Salisbury, *Metalogii*, Lib. ii., cap. 7. This author, who was an Englishman, and bishop of Chartres, was born about 1110, and died in 1180. He was the friend of St. Thomas A'Beckett. He wrote many works, an account of which will be found in Bayle's Dictionary. The one referred to by us is his *Metalogius seu Tractatus de Logica Philosophia*, &c.

† This is expressly admitted by Buhle, *Hist. de la Philosophie Moderne*, t. i., p. 723, quoted by Hallam, vol. ii., chap. 9, part 2. Note. He adds, "This author raises on the whole a favourable notion of Anselm and Aquinas; but he scarcely notices any other." Buhle is a German writer, and the reference is to the French translation.

the scholastics were so taken up with the study of Aristotle, that they neglected the Scriptures. Nothing can be more unfounded. The theological course included lectures upon nearly the whole of the Old and New Testament, and there is scarcely a theological writer of any note during the middle ages, who did not compose commentaries upon some, and often upon very large portions of the Bible. Thus St. Thomas wrote upon Job, the Canticle of Canticles, Isaiah, Jeremiah, the four Gospels, and the Epistles of St. Paul. The *Catena Aurea* on the four Gospels, which he dedicated to Urban IV., is a work of prodigious labour, for the exposition consists entirely of quotations from the fathers. There is, moreover, amongst his works a commentary of his own upon Matthew and John. The former is a *Reportata*, which was taken down from the lectures of St. Thomas by his pupils. The latter was partly written by St. Thomas, and the remainder, though a *Reportata*, was afterwards corrected by him. The spiritual works of St. Thomas, and especially his beautiful hymns, *Pange lingua gloriosi—Sacris solemniis juncta sint gaudia—Verbum supernum prodiens*, and *Lauda Sion Salvatorem*, are well known to all those who are in the slightest degree acquainted with books of Catholic devotion.

St. Bonaventure wrote, besides an Introduction to the Holy Scriptures, and Sermons on the Six days of Creation, commentaries on the Psalms, Ecclesiastes, Wisdom, the Lamentations of Jeremiah, and on Matthew, Luke, and John. He also wrote numerous spiritual works, which have been always held in the highest estimation* by all devout persons. The Franciscans look up to him and Duns Scotus as their guides in theological opinions. They generally fix the date of Scotus's birth in 1274, the year in which St. Bonaventure died, and do not fail to claim the special protection of heaven for their order, which was no sooner deprived of one great light, than it was supplied with another. Scotus was certainly one of the most renowned schoolmen of his times; and his eulogists remark, that not only cities, as in the case of Homer, but that three nations contended for the honour of being his birthplace. He, however, sometimes carries his love of subtle disquisitions too far; and on the

* See Eulogiums upon his spiritual works extracted from Tithe-
maus, Gerson, and others, in Du Pin's Life of Bonaventure.

whole, is very much inferior to St. Thomas, whom it was his great ambition to rival.

The schoolmen have been accused* of wasting their time in "trifling disquisitions about the nature of Angels, their mode of operation, and their means of conversing." These disquisitions still appear to many persons very curious and interesting;† they served as useful themes for the exercise of the intellectual faculties, and were, at all events, infinitely more innocent than the obscene novels, the bigoted pamphlets, and atheistical tracts, with which the press is now loaded every day and every hour. Scholasticism sharpened the intellect, and prepared it for triumphs in every department of science. It made learning the most honoured of all possessions; so that when St. Thomas died, sovereign princes and the most celebrated Universities, contended for the honour of possessing his body; and when it was granted to France, it was received at Toulouse by one hundred and fifty thousand people, at the head of whom were the Archbishops of Toulouse and Narbonne, and Lewis, duke of Anjou, brother to king Charles V: and when Scotus went to Cologne, he was received by the whole city in procession. Almost immediately after the introduction of Scholasticism, celebrated schools appeared in a vast number of places, which became Universities at the end of the twelfth, and during the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries. Such were Paris, Bologna, Oxford, Padua, Naples, Toulouse, Salamanca, Montpellier, Orleans, Cambridge, Prague, and Leipsic. The number of pupils who attended each of these Universities, have been estimated at from ten to thirty thousand. In these same Dark Ages the Popes and dignified Clergy were the munificent patrons of learning, the mariner's compass, and the art of printing was discovered, the Divine Comedy was written,

* See Hallam, ubi sup., p. 322.

† These disquisitions did not appear trifling to the Fathers of the Church who had previously discussed every question of this kind, the mere repetition of which has been since imputed as a crime to the schoolmen. We only require any one who has the slightest misgivings on this point, to look at the words *Angelus* and *Angeli*, in the index to the sixth and seventh volumes of the Benedictine edition of the works of St. Augustine, where he will find a vast number of subtle enquiries regarding the creation, nature, endowments, and operation of angels.

and Petrarch was crowned in the Capitol. Perhaps the impartial student of those times will acknowledge that scholastic pursuits, so far from being hurtful, were the very best which could have been adopted to arouse all the energies of the mind, and to create a burning thirst for knowledge; that if there was more useless, there was far less pernicious learning in the ancient than in the modern schools; and that, as the monks preserved the fire of knowledge from being utterly extinguished by the deluge of barbarism, the schoolmen fanned the feeble flame into that blaze which has since so brightly and so steadily illumined the world.

ART. II.—1. *Der Wahnsinn in den vier letzten Jahrhunderten, &c.* Von Dr. RUD. LEUBUSCHER. (Insanity during the four last Centuries, by Dr. RUD. LEUBUSCHER.) 8vo., Halle, 1848.

2. *Geschichte der Hexenprocesse.* Von Dr. WILHELM GOTTLIEB SOLDAN. (History of the Trials for Witchcraft, from the original sources, by Dr. WILLIAM GOTTLIEB SOLDAN.) 8vo., Stuttgart, 1843.

THE true history of witchcraft yet remains to be written, after all that has appeared on the subject. English authors have contributed but little to the investigation of this dark page of the history of mankind; it is in the works of the French physicians and philosophers, and still more among the speculative writers of Germany, that we shall find the amplest store of material relating to the black art. Of those who entered the field of controversy regarding this occult science, during the prevalence of the witchmania, there is scarce one who openly professes his disbelief of all magical dealings. The opponents of this hideous delusion confine their pens to the discussion of individual cases, or to just animadversions on the conduct of many of the judges and advocates in these celebrated trials; yet all seem agreed as to the occasional existence of witches, and as to the truth of magic being really practised, and with success. Men of all ranks, of all religions, and of all political views, too often united, in this dark period of Europe's history, in hurrying wretches to the stake, or to the gibbet, whom we now should consign to

the lunatic asylum, or to the gaol. It was not until the gradual progress of science, and especially till the study of mental diseases had become more general and more complete, that men began to doubt of the reality of witchcraft, to rub their eyes, and to ask if it was not all a horrid dream, out of which the world was but just awakening. It will be our object, in the succeeding pages, to enquire how far magic was really practised in sincerity and truth, how far the accusers and the accused were alike the victims of a terrible and sanguinary delusion, and to unravel the dark tangled web woven by popular credulity, and fostered by penal enactments, for which we may now-a-days truly blush.

By certain Protestant and Calvinist writers it has been attempted to cast all the odium of these trials, these torturings and burnings, upon the Catholic faith and its professors, forgetful as they are, or at least unwilling to own, that it was not till the full blaze of the so-called glorious light of the Reformation had beamed forth, that Europe saw unmoved the daily executions, and the daily arrests of supposed witches, both in Catholic and Protestant lands. To an English Protestant king we owe one of the most fully developed and most credulous works on the doings of the necromancers; and while Catholics partook largely of the general delusion, their clergy at least deserve the character of impartiality, for no small number of the sufferers were priests, and religious men and women.

Up to the present time, the few English writers upon magic and witchcraft, have contented themselves with detailing the more harrowing and exciting of the fearful histories, wrung by torture from the wretched victims; or at the best, if they attempted to account for these strange doings, they have classed all the revelations together, as a concerted system of lies and deceit, forgetful that people do not ordinarily swear to falsehoods which would conduct them most certainly to the worst of deaths. We do not, at the present moment, remember a single English medical writer who has treated scientifically, or otherwise, the all-important psychological question, "How far were the accused witches guilty of the deeds they swore to? and how far were they guilty of their own deaths by inventing falsehoods, the sole offspring of their excited imaginations?" Nor has any Catholic writer handled this subject in our language; all that has yet been published has been

the work of Protestants, who have too often made use of their researches to heap calumnies and false imputations upon our holy religion. It will hardly become the writer of this paper, a physician, and no theologian, to enter upon the disputed question, does demoniacal magic, the "Teuflische Magie" of the Germans, really exist? are certain incantations efficacious to raise up the devil? or can his help, by such means, be obtained to perform, by God's permission, supernatural feats; such as flying through the air, floating on water, or passing through bolts and bars without let or hindrance? That possession by the devil really did occur under the Jewish dispensation, we have the undoubted testimony of the Author of all truth himself; that it has existed in some form under the Christian Dispensation, the unanimous testimony of the Fathers, and the very institution of the office of Exorcist sufficiently establish; but with this question, as it relates to the present day, we shall only grapple, in so far as we shall investigate, by the light of modern science, the records of the supposed cases of demoniacal possession that have been published during, and since the dark period of the Witch mania. While thus preparing to try, by the means afforded in these our days, the instances adduced in favour of the direct agency of the evil one, let us not forget, that in this age of scoffing unbelief we may err by obstinate incredulity, as much as did our ancestors by too great readiness of belief. We indeed possess, now-a-days, means of analysing and explaining many of these singular histories, which were not available to our forefathers, even could they for a moment have emancipated themselves from the slavery of the delusion and popular belief of the day. Thanks to the German writers on Insanity, the knowledge of the aberrations of the human intellect when diseased, has greatly advanced during the last half century; and much that was before ascribed to demoniacal influence by the credulous, or to wilful and systematic deceit by the unbeliever, will now be sheltered under the all-powerful plea of insanity. It is in this spirit, then, that we propose to examine the volumes now before us, to sift the evidence presented to us in the elaborate, but unconnected work of Leubuscher, as compared with that which we find in the more lucid, more classical, but infinitely more bigoted work of Soldan.

Both these writers are, however, evidences of the spirit

of Rationalist unbelief, which has of late years gained so much ground in Germany. It is plain that Leubuscher places no faith in the recorded miracles of our blessed Lord; he believes not in the reality of the expulsion of devils by Jesus of Nazareth, but looking with Strauss upon all these wonders as exploded myths, he classes them with the impostures and marvellous tales of the witchmania, as alike unworthy of belief. Yet still this author exhibits no bitter rancour against the Catholic faith; he investigates the facts laid before him from a medical, and not from a controversial point of view. And even when touching on the delicate subject of demoniacal possession in the convents of Germany and France, he rarely turns aside to inflict a blow on those who differ from him in religious creed. Not so, however, the second author on our list. Though he too, as far as scepticism and doubt of the miracles of Scripture will go, may take his place among the Rationalist illuminati of Germany, yet in the bitterness of his hostility to the Catholic faith, he might rank with Calvin, or with Luther himself. In the fury of his antipapal zeal, he draws under his fostering wing all the heretical sects that have existed, from the foul mysticism of the Gnostics, to the Lutherans and Calvinists of the present day. Every heresy that has sprung up since the days of the apostles, he regards as a manifestation of the spirit of Protestantism against the insidious tyranny of the Roman Church, and endeavours to gloss over their manifold and fearful enormities, both in doctrine and practice, by impugning the veracity of the historical testimony against them. Thus St. Jerome, St. Epiphanius, and many of the brightest lights in the Catholic Church are, by Soldan, branded as false witnesses, who have suppressed the truth, to make their foes appear in an unfavourable light. We willingly relinquish to this author the heretics he claims; we give him credit for having classed them all as "*Protesting*" against the one holy Catholic and Apostolic Church, and congratulate him upon the favourable point of union he has discovered amid so many conflicting sects. Still the narrative of Soldan, with this exception, is a work of great talent and interest. Though not a man of science, he has spared no pains in research, and where his judgment has not been warped by hostility to the Jesuits, or to the Inquisition, he has produced a volume free from the mysticism of Germany, and from

the idle tale-collecting and retailing of the English writers upon Necromancy.

We cannot better commence our investigation than by quoting the introduction to Leubuscher's work.

"To form a right judgment of the spiritual life of any individual man, it is necessary to consider it from two opposite points of view. Man's inward life must be studied in its individual existence, and also in its relation to society at large. A man of high commanding genius can, by the very force of that genius, incite and lead thousands on in the way of mental development and cultivation; but on the other hand, the prevailing ideas of society, and of the public, exercise an irresistible influence on the individual man. No individual can entirely shake off the prejudice of the age he lives in, the error and the falsehood peculiar to his time, hangs like a leaden weight around him, to keep down the boldest exertions and inspirations of genius, and leaves but too often a dark stain upon the purest and the noblest characters."—p. 1.

Insanity may arise in two ways, it may be the result of gradual morbid changes within the body, and then the disordered condition of the frame exercises, sooner or later, its influence on the mind; or, secondly, from external causes, as by popular outcry and delusion, the mind may be directly shaken, and the intellect disturbed, while the body still in appearance, if not in reality, retains its health. But in whichever form insanity develops itself, the created being remains the same; all that is marvellous in the symptoms is nothing really new, but an altered and abnormal manifestation from the diseased and altered condition of the mind. Our author then strives to prove that the effects of the popular belief in witchcraft, in the middle ages, had a decided influence on those whom insanity marked out for its victims. As the minds of even the most sensible men are swayed more or less by a violent popular outcry and belief, so is it ever seen that the delusions of the lunatic are an exaggeration and distortion of the prevailing ideas of his time. Visit an asylum of the present day, and the lunatic will there gravely tell you of the imaginary dangers by which he is surrounded. Steam guns of fearful power are being constructed to destroy him, the electric telegraph conveys his every word and thought to his implacable enemies, who watch his steps through telescopes of enormous power, while mesmerists and magnetisers have exercised their nefarious arts upon his frame, till he is no longer the same

being, but his soul has migrated into some other body. And the like delusions prevailed during the witchmania, only that they assumed a shape in accordance with the prevailing terrors of the day. That which even sound minds then dreaded as a possibility, became a fearful reality to the maniac of the 15th and 16th century. The direct influence of incantations, the bodily presence of Satan at his hideous midnight revels, where every species of blasphemous orgy was perpetrated, was but the realization, in an individual, of the popular belief, which fed with a greedy appetite on these details of unnatural horrors and marvellous feats, till at length, even the sounder minds were shaken, and philosophers, divines, and last, but not least, learned physicians joined in the popular outcry, and bounded on each other in the chase of the supposed witches. As might be expected, it was especially on the excitable temperament of the weaker sex, that these tales and fears produced the most marked effect. There is a form of malady well known to medical men, where, with or without apparent bodily derangement, the mind becomes strangely prone to delusion and deceit, where the powers of invention, too, seem often to be multiplied a hundred fold, so that the most improbable stories, the most impossible sensations and maladies, are related or simulated by the patient. That "Hysteria," for so we name this disease, was as frequent in former days as it is now, there can be no doubt; and so constantly did those thus affected simulate the supposed symptoms of demoniacal possession, that witchcraft came to be considered almost the exclusive property of the fair sex, while the aged men of the community escaped unaccused, and consequently unhurt. One of the most singular characteristics of hysteria, is the faculty of imitation developed by this disease. A girl is seized with an epileptic, or it may be merely an hysteric, fit in a public school, and forthwith many others of her companions are affected in like manner. The same was the case in the convents in the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. A hysterical nun or novice exhibited the phenomena of hysteria, her fellow nuns gathered around her, and retired, perchance to their cells, deeply impressed and terrified at the strange scene they had witnessed. Pondering over the case and its possible causes, the all-prevailing idea of witchcraft and of demoniacal possession had, perhaps, ere the morning

came, fixed itself in the minds of many of the community; the subject was soon openly discussed, and possession by the devil once agreed upon, it only remained to point out the author of the mischief. Soon some hapless nun or lay sister, or dependant on the charity of the convent, became the object of suspicion, and once suspected, her every action was watched and canvassed, till the feeling broke forth in a general accusation. Let us take out of the numerous examples before us, one related by Weier, or Wierius, in his curious book "*de Præstigiis dæmonum.*" Weier, it is true, was a Protestant, but though a believer in the existence of magic, his good sense occasionally enabled him to discover disease of both mind and body in cases laid before him.

"The convent of Kentorp, in the old Mark, became suddenly the scene of a strange malady. At first only a few nuns were attacked with convulsions, but speedily the nervous paroxysms extended (by imitation) to the other inmates. During the accession of a paroxysm, the patient did not lose her recollection, she was conscious of surrounding objects, but had altogether lost the power of speech. The muscles of the throat were fearfully convulsed, the patients uttered fearful shrieks, and frequently endeavoured to bite the bystanders. If when they had retired for the night, one of the community was seized with convulsions, the very sound of her struggles, even in the dark, brought on the fit in numerous others who lay in the same chamber."

It seems that the malady first appeared in a certain Anna Lemgon, who was affected with fits of epileptico-hysteric character. Indeed, her fits seem to have partaken more of epilepsy than of hysteria, till her mind, at length, gave way, and she became dull and incapable of carrying on rational conversation. All the community, however, with Anna Lemgon at their head, laid the blame of the supposed demoniacal possession upon the cook of the convent, one Else Kamensis, as Weier calls her, and upon the mother and brother of this unfortunate creature. The poor cook had been affected with convulsions like the rest, but this did not avail, they swore that on her part it was merely simulation, that her evil deeds might not be suspected. Else Kamensis was then, in the usual course, put to the question and to the torture by the authorities, and shortly confessed the whole; but on the scaffold she retracted what she had said, viz., that she had bewitched the community by mixing poison with their food, and con-

fessed that she had acted only by means of incantations. It is easy to see that hysterical convulsions were here, even by the judicious Weier, mistaken for the work of the devil, and the delusion terminated, as but too often happened, in a judicial murder. It may be urged that the unfortunate victim made a confession of her guilt; but when we have examined, with the aid of Soldan's researches, the mode of investigation in common use in those cruel days, we shall cease to wonder at these apparently death-bed confessions, or to regard them as testimonies of the slightest weight or value.*

We could multiply instances of this kind without number, the work of Weier, from which we have just quoted, supplies numerous cases, but our space will not allow us to extend this portion of our subject.

It will be seen then, that Dr. Leubuscher admits of two forms of insanity, the individual and the social; the former isolated as it were from the world, and only to a certain degree influenced by the prevailing doctrines and errors of the times; the latter, often arising from a single case, but spreading like a fearful epidemic through all classes of the population. The convulsive movements and wild vagaries of an excited preacher at the present day, soon spread among his hearers, as the hysterical paroxysm of a single nun was speedily imitated by the whole community. All medical men are aware, that strong impressions thus

* The disorders here described, occurred chiefly in those convents where the originally strict rule of discipline had been relaxed or broken, and where the spirit of holy mortification, so essential to a religious life, had not been sufficiently sustained. Like the rest of his Protestant brethren, Dr. Leubuscher is totally unable to understand the hidden sweetness of a full and entire devotion to the service of God; the perfect and happy calm of a soul whose whole mind is directed to the contemplation of the life and passion of our blessed Lord, and to the singing of those hymns of praise and love here on earth, which they humbly hope to sing more perfectly before the face of God in heaven. That the monastic life is to be censured as a fruitful cause of insanity we utterly deny, it only may become so to those unhappy individuals, who, like Luther, have fallen from their first fervour, and have become tepid in the service of God. In such persons the combat between their solemn engagements, and their worldly predispositions, frequently shakes and disturbs the mind to such a degree, that the wild vagaries of the maniac succeed to the humble and happy obedience of the monk.

repeated, day by day, on a weak and timorous mind, may become, at length, to that mind, absolute realities, the intellect becomes disturbed, sights are seen, and sounds are heard, which have no real existence, but which, to the diseased imagination, are now no longer dreams, but assume a positive and real form.

We must beware, however, of fatiguing our readers by professional details and disquisitions on the precise limits of insanity, a matter indeed, concerning which there is yet considerable difference of opinion. It is generally, however, acknowledged, that so long as no positive delusion exists, insanity cannot be said to be present. For individual cases this definition may suffice, but under the influence of popular excitement, the soundest minds may become tinged with the prevailing error, even in defiance of their better judgments and feelings. Need we seek further for an illustration on this point, than the recent popular delusion in England on the subject of the Catholic Hierarchy? At first, sensible men smiled at the idea of danger from the Pope of Rome, but as the tide of popular fury, lashed into the wildest excitement by the "insidious" letter of a Prime Minister, rose higher and higher, and roared at their very thresholds, the courage of the best, with a few noble exceptions, wavered and trembled, till at length, they yielded to the stream, and were borne onwards on its breast to persecute and insult their fellow citizens. The most absurd and ridiculous tales found greedy listeners; we heard, at Exeter, of wise churchwardens and a vicar gravely investigating a monstrous story, invented by a fanatical girl; old ladies of sound Protestant mind trembled, lest in hiring an illiterate female servant, they might introduce a hidden Jesuit into their families, and all Europe laughed at honest John Bull frightened out of his usual dignified propriety, by the apparition of a scarlet hat within the precincts of Westminster.

Soldan, however, differs materially from Dr. Leubuscher upon the subject of epidemics of insanity, he almost denies the possibility of their occurrence, though he has before him the well known incontrovertible instances of the dancing mania, of the Flagellants, and of the Tarantismus, of the Middle Ages. In our opinion, the witch-mania was, in a great degree, but another of these popular delusions. Indeed, in the latter part of his most readable volume,

Soldan explains a seeming difficulty which he puts forth prominently in his introduction. In combating the supposition of epidemics of insanity, he says:

"We meet with the same difficulties when we attempt to refer the phantasies of the witches to mental alienation. Is there then such a thing as a methodical madness, which, with a thousand peculiarities, shall yet pursue, amidst hundreds of individuals, the same path? Is there a spiritual intercourse between the insane, so that one person can declare before the bar of justice what have been the delusions of another, and when and where these delusions have been manifested? Does there exist a special policy in madness, which for years shall know how to conceal and deny its own delusions, and shall only first declare them as truth under the influence of torture, and why, in fine, has this madness lasted but so long as it led to the scaffold, while it is unknown in the asylums of the present day?"—p. 506.

To these questions Leubuscher most satisfactorily replies, that the universal belief of the times regarding the proceedings of the witches, and the well known, repeatedly discussed proceedings and confessions of the accused, necessarily produced the greatest similarity in the replies of the fresh victims; and that, when we come to examine individual cases in reference to special times, localities, individuals and deeds, we shall find that often the first of the accused under torture, or under the terror thereof, indicated and implicated others, who were forthwith seized, and subjected to the same horrible torments, while leading questions were put to them *to force* them to agree to all that the first accused had detailed of their misdeeds. Indeed, too often it is plain, that the torture was only applied to force out revelations of this nature, and so well was this known, that popes, emperors, kings, jurists, and clergy, constantly protested against the foul injustice of prejudging thus the accused. But this mode of procedure was, after all, only the usual one adopted in all suspected criminal cases in those days, only that, from the zeal of the judges and advocates, too ready a belief was accorded to these miserable accusations, the offspring of a distempered brain, or wrung forth by the atrocious torments inflicted on suspected individuals. The narrative of Soldan supplies us with a lucid history of the ordinary mode of proceedings in cases of suspected witchcraft. The whole of the chapter, the fourteenth of his work, is full of instruction, and reveals in hideous, but, alas, too correct colours,

the whole ignominy of the witch trials. In the first place, the judges themselves were predisposed against the accused. Witchcraft was so universally believed in by Catholics and Protestants alike, that no doubt seems to have been raised of its prevalence, and the investigators or inquisitors, of what religious belief they might be, directed their whole care, not to the question whether the accused were guilty or no, but to the one point of laying open before the world the fearful dealings of the suspected individuals with Satan and his myrmidons. Soldan even insinuates that the secret of the confessional was not kept on these occasions, but brings forward no proof to substantiate this accusation. From the Protestant clergy no such secrecy was required. Thus, in the witch-processes at Burg-friedberg, in 1665, the Protestant inspector was daily in the prison visiting the accused witches, he worked on their minds by threats and by persuasion, till he elicited fresh matter for accusation, all of which he duly conveyed to the judges. And this treacherous proceeding elicited no reproof, but, on the contrary, received the warmest approbation of the court, even so, that the private report of the pastor was ordered to be enrolled among the judicial accounts of the trial! It seems to have become gradually an universal practice to commence the "inquisitio" before the "accusatio" was openly brought forward, and then collecting evidence on every side, they called the whole a "cumulatio," and directed this engine of destruction against the suspected witch. Horst relates a curious instance of the blind perversity of the judges.

"Five or six women of Lindheim, were frightfully tortured to make them confess that they had dug up the body of a child recently buried in the churchyard of that place, in order to concoct from it the witch-broth (*Hexenbrei*) for their incantations. They acknowledged the fact. The husband of one of the accused, at length, prevailed upon the authorities to allow the grave to be opened in the presence of the pastor of the village, and of several witnesses. They found the child's body untouched in its coffin. But the authorities, in the excess of their fanaticism, declared that the body they found was a mere image, placed there by the devil to balk the process of justice; they insisted, that as the accused had confessed, their confessions must stand good, and that, for the honour of the Trinity, as it was commanded that all witches and necromancers should be destroyed, the accused must be brought to the stake. And so the whole six were burnt."—(Horst. *Zauber Bibl.* Th. ii. p. 374.

Rewards were liberally offered to all who would denounce or discover a witch, and in some of the churches, as in Milan, according to Bodinus, a box was placed with a slit in the lid, into which anonymous accusations might be inserted. What a field was here opened for private malice, for avarice, and for revenge !

"When the judge had collected the necessary facts (*Indicien*) he opened the trial. But what were these indications, (*Indicien*) as received by the authorities, or rather what was not received as such ? A bad reputation, often depending on the word of some poor wretch, who, years before, had suffered tortures and death for similar crimes, often, too, not even supported by witnesses ; being the daughter of an executed witch ; being starved and houseless, or being sunk in the depths of sin and degradation ; all these were sufficient indicia. On the other hand, great diligence at work, a rapid and unaccountable rise of fortune, a simple threat to a neighbour, followed or not by some evil befalling that individual, or even having been in the fields before a sudden storm of hail fell and injured the crops, was quite sufficient to establish the reputation of a witch. She who avoided Scylla, fell into Charybdis. It was not less dangerous to heal than to injure. In the witch-trials of Buseck, it is remarked, 'that the accused had administered laurel-berries to her sick daughter-in-law, whereupon her sickness abated. And the Fiscal (law advocate) concludes from thence, that she had previously induced the malady she afterwards healed. Again, a cabinet maker's wife frequently visited her neighbour's house, in Schletstadt, and had (by witchcraft) lamed the arm of a young child therein, which she afterwards in part healed with lotions and herbs.' (*Theatrum de veneficiis* Frankf. 1586, p. 5.) Suspicion fell upon those who neglected the services of the church, and not less on the most regular attenders thereon, for the latter sought by this hypocrisy to escape suspicion. If, when arrested, the supposed witch exhibited signs of terror, it was the result of her evil conscience ; if, on the contrary, she showed no fear, but humbly followed her captors, it was the devil who had hardened and fortified her soul." (*Soldan*, p. 259.

How was it possible for the suspected to escape ? The marvel to us is, not that so many witches were put to death, but that more were not destroyed under the influence of this hideous delusion.

The accused was now arrested and imprisoned. The prisons, three hundred years ago, were, alas, not such as we see now, after the exertions of Howard and Beccaria. They were veritable dungeons, fearful gaols of the worst kind, and if, in a prison, there was one cell more horrible

than the rest, to it the suspected witches were consigned. The details of their horrors by an eye witness who even in those dark days raised his appealing voice, may distress, but will likewise instruct our readers.

"The prisons are ever in thick strong towers, in gateways, block-houses, or in cellars or deep pits. And in these there are huge beams piled two or three upon the other, so that they may be raised by a post and screw, and through these beams are holes to receive the arms and legs of the prisoner. When a prisoner is brought in, they raise or screw up the beams, and the prisoner sitteth down on a block of wood, or on a stone, or on the ground, with his legs in the lower, and his arms in the upper tier of holes. Then they let down the beams again, and screw them fast, so that the prisoner may not move leg or arm, and this they term lying in the stocks.

"And some prisons have great iron or wooden crosses to which they attach the prisoner by the arms, legs, and neck, so that they must ever stand, or lie, or hang, according as the cross is placed, whereunto they are fastened. And some have strong iron bars, five, six, or seven fourths of an ell in length, with iron bands at either end, whereunto they fasten the arms of the prisoner at the wrists. And these bars are attached by huge chains unto the walls, so that the prisoners must ever stay in the same spot.

"And some fix heavy irons on the feet, so that the prisoner cannot stretch them out, nor yet draw them up to his body. And some have narrow cavities in the walls, wherein a man scarce may sit, or lie, or stand, and therein they shut up many with iron doors, so that they cannot move nor turn round. And in some prisons there are pits fifteen, twenty, and thirty fathoms deep, all walled around like wells or cellars after the strongest fashion, and opening into the prisons above by narrow holes with strong doors or gratings, and into these they let down the prisoners with cords, and draw them out when they have need of them. And such places have I myself seen when I visited those detained therein, but there are many more and of divers forms, some even more horrible, some likewise less terrible than these.

"And according as the nature of the place shall be, the prisoners sit in fearful cold, so that their feet freeze, yea, are verily frozen off, and if they ever come out they must for their lives long crawl about as cripples. Some lie in constant darkness and never see the light of day, so that they know not when it is day and when it is night. All, sooner or later lose more or less the use and power of their limbs, they lie restless in filth and noisome smells, much more miserably indeed than the very cattle in the stalls. They are ill fed, nor can they sleep in quiet, they have much woe, heavy thoughts, evil dreams, terrors and contests. Moreover are they daily ill-treated and beaten by the gaolers and their assistants, for to sum up in one word all prisoners are poor!

"And because all this endureth for the poor prisoner often not one week, but months, and even two, three, and four years, so do they, although at first of good heart, assuredly become at length weak and timid, impatient and sullen, and if not quite mad, they are distrustful and capricious.

"O ye judges! what then are ye doing? Of what are ye thinking? Do you not fear that you are often guilty of the terrible death of your prisoners?"—(Prætorius—von Zauberey, p. 211.)

Before the witches were examined by the judge, the witnesses against them were heard in private. No testimony was rejected. Individuals whose word would have been scorned at even in that age, were here received as true and faithful witnesses. James the First of England expressly declares, that accomplices, perjurers, the spouse or husband of the accused, nay their very children, should be allowed to swear away their parents' lives. The most ridiculous incidents were greedily accepted, coincidences the most natural and the most simple were noted down as the work of Satan, while all this time the accused pined away in her hideous prison, ignorant of the testimony against her, ignorant of the very names of those who bore false witness to her prejudice.

And next they passed to the examination of the prisoner. Trembling and exhausted with the rigours of her imprisonment, the poor victim was brought forth to meet and rebut the questioning of those long practised in all the chicanery of the law as it then stood, with the heavy conviction too upon her soul, that to deny her guilt, was but to subject her to torments more terrible than those she had already endured. The "*Malleus Maleficarum*," the text book of the witch-finders, and a work replete with the grossest credulity, cruelty, and intolerance, but withal emanating from the spirit of the age, and accepted by Catholics and Protestants alike, advises that the interrogation shall commence by the question, Do witches really exist? And it adds as comment, "*Nota quod maleficæ ut plurimum negant.* N.B. That witches generally deny the same. Then must you ask—How then? are they unjustly condemned to the stake?" "But whosoever," continues this benighted book, "denies the existence of witches must be burnt as a witch, for '*hæresis est maxima, opera maleficorum non credere.*' It is the greatest of heresies not to believe in the evil doings of witches."

We have just quoted from a Catholic work, for alas, the

Malleus Maleficarum was the work of Catholic writers, though it was a text book among Protestants also.

Let us see how the latter proceeded in their investigation. In the sentence of the sheriff's court (Schoppenstuhl) at Leipzig, in 1599, we read as follows :

"Hath the accused poured liquids on the boy of W. Brosius (a favourite mode of bewitching), so that thereafter the boy hath become blind ? and finally, when pardon was promised unto her, she has of her free will acknowledged that at the pouring thereof she used the words, 'The youth shall become blind in the devil's name.' And as you have now satisfied yourselves thereof, or yet may hereafter satisfy yourselves thereof, that the boy became shortly after blind, and should the prisoner adhere unto her former confession, so shall she for such deeds of witchcraft here confessed, and because she hath received promise of free pardon from you, and hath beside her confession been subjected to the torture, so shall she suffer death by the sword."*—Benedict Carpzov, No. xvi.

Our readers may find it difficult to understand the cramped and abstruse language of a German legal document which we have here closely translated. It is scarcely possible to believe, in these days of well ordered judicial proceedings, that such manifest iniquity, such barefaced falsehood, could pass unnoticed and uncondemned. Yet such indeed was the case, every art, every falsehood was justifiable, if it were only employed in rooting out the supposed plague of witches which had spread over the land.

As was usual in crimes of high magnitude, no advocate was allowed to the accused. What could a wretched, and too often an illiterate female do, to avert the impending sentence ? Exhausted by the bitter rigours of her incarceration, terrified by the certainty of the most fearful tortures if she persisted in denying her guilt, she too often anticipated her sentence, by a voluntary confession, or else, if opportunity occurred, laid violent hands upon herself and perished, a wretched suicide, within the walls of her prison. It was the dread of the rack that brought about this fearful termination of her worn out life,—for the torture (Folter) was the chief engine for eliciting confessions of witchcraft. Of the horrors of the torture we scarcely dare to speak, but in justice to the poor criminals who

* Had she not confessed she would have been burned alive.

underwent the same, we must proceed. Whoever, like the present writer, has examined the fearful dungeons of the old Castle of Baden, or still more, has stood in the torture chamber, yet existing in all its integrity in the Rathhaus of Regensburg, will realize the horrors that have been perpetrated within those walls in the name of justice. In the latter locality, every engine of torture yet remains as it was two hundred years ago. The rack stands idly in its place, the iron ladder leans against the wall, the iron hare, "*eiserne hase*," lies upon the rack, and bristles with its iron points in vain; the Spanish ass, a narrow upright board on which the victims must ride for hours with heavy weights attached to their feet, is now no longer bestrode by weeping criminals; yet two hundred years ago, these instruments were in daily use. The desk, behind which the judges and the Reporters sat, is yet spotted with ink which flowed commensurate with the tears and lamentations of the tortured, but the ink has been dry for two centuries past. To convince our readers that these hideous instruments did not stand displayed for mere empty show, we extract from *Leibs Consil. et Respons.*—*Francof. 1666*, p. 463, the report upon the "question" of one of the suspected witches. The report emanates from the officers of Justice appointed to examine the delinquent, while she was subjected to the torture to force from her a confession of her guilt.

"Philipp Wagner, the second witness, and the magistrate there appointed, deposes. 'That the accused Maderin, hath not under the first question deposed anything, and thereupon that the torture was repeated, after the executioner had cut off her hair, and bound together her hands, and placed her then upon the ladder, and poured brandy upon her head and set fire thereunto, so as to burn away the scalp entirely. And he then lighted feathers dipped in sulphur (*schwefelfedern*) and burned her therewith under the arms and on the neck. Thereafter he drew her up to the roof by her hands which were tied behind her back, and so left her hanging there for two or three hours, while the master went to his breakfast. And when the master returned, the executioner poured brandy upon her back and set fire thereunto, and he laid many heavy weights upon her back and then drew up her body from the ground. Thereafter he placed her again upon the ladder, and placed a rough unplanned board with many sharp points thereon beneath her back, and so drew her by her hands up to the roof. And further he hath screwed together her two great toes and her thumbs, and then putting a strong bar between her arms, hath

hanged her up thereby, and she hanged there for about a quarter of an hour, and in that time she fell out of one fainting fit into another."

It is true that on this occasion a complaint was made of the torture having been too unsparingly applied, but from numerous other processes it is too plain, that the above was no extraordinary course.* The learned and Saintly Jesuit, Frederick Spee, tells us that in certain places the executioner had full power of directing and deciding upon the amount of torture to be administered, and that many of this confraternity openly boasted, that they were such

* In some cases the poor tortured wretch exhibited the most extraordinary power of enduring pain. This was ascribed by her tormentors to the agency of the devil, and to the efficacy of her having anointed herself previous to the "question" with an unguent made of the boiled flesh of unbaptized children. We believe that in many cases the nervous energy was so exhausted by the rigours of the previous imprisonment, that the nerves of the extremities, the afferent nerves of Marshall Hall, failed in their office of conveying the sensation of pain to the brain, or on the other hand through mental excitement and terror, the brain itself had lost more or less of its receiving power. Under the influence of strong excitement as in a battle, or from the mental effect of supposed mesmeric passes, individuals certainly become insensible to pain, though not all to the same degree. The belief in the power of a salve concocted by the demons and sorcerers was universal. The recipe for this hellish unguent is given in two different formulæ by old John Baptista Porta, in the second book of his natural magic. 'Puerorum pinguedinem aheneo vaso decoquendo ex aqua capiunt, inspissando quod ex elixatione ultimum novissimumque subsidet; cum hac immiscent eleoselinum, aconitum, frondes populneas, et fuliginem. Vel aliter sic, Sium, acorum vulgare, pentaphyllon, vespertilionis sanguinem, solanum somniferum et oleum.' It was a singular addition to the popular fallacy regarding this dreaded ointment, that it was said to be harmless when used or touched without the "animus lædendi," or evil intent, while princes, magistrates, and men in power, were exempt at all times from its influence. Leubüscher is inclined to believe, that certain drugs were really swallowed by the sorcerers, which produced hallucinations similar to those which in our own day we see to result from the mastication of "Hachish." This powerful drug was well known in those days in the East, and may it not perhaps have been occasionally brought over from thence into Western Europe, and handed about mysteriously as possessing supernatural powers?

adepts in their art, that no one came under their hands whom they did not at length force to confess ; and these men, he adds, were therefore esteemed the best of their kind and were greatly sought for, when others of more tender conscience refused to proceed to such extremities.

All the above horrors were perpetrated with the view and sole object of obtaining the acknowledgment of guilt. Human nature could not, in general, resist such extreme and long continued pain ; unsupported, as in the case of the Christian martyrs, by a higher power, the wretched subjects of the torture-question sooner or later confessed to all the questions put to them, and the ice once broken, they poured forth a catalogue of their crimes, and implicated others, to any amount that their credulous judges required. The obstinacy of the accused, and her patience and endurance under the first tortures, was ascribed solely to the assistance of the enemy of mankind, and each question and answer having been duly enrolled in the protocol, the whole was openly read and commented upon, till the public were as well acquainted with the case, as were the judges themselves. Often, when the pains of the "question" had subsided, the poor wretch recalled her former confession, and thus assuredly subjected herself to fresh torments and to a still more painful death. For it was needful, thought the sages of those days, that the relapsing sinner should be punished more severely, than those who adhered to their first confessions of guilt. One great argument constantly employed by the advocates of the existence of witchcraft was, that we so constantly find gratuitous confessions to have been made by suspected persons, of their own free will, and before any torture was applied. But when the real facts and occasions of these confessions are laid before us, we discover, that every acknowledgment of guilt was considered voluntary, so long as it was not made under the actual application of the torture. The fear of the question being applied here counted for nothing ; yet the poor accused, well knowing that she could never regain her place in society, that her neighbours, even if by some chance she escaped with her life, would ever look upon her with suspicion and hatred, often freely sought by a voluntary acknowledgment of guilt, to escape the reiterated tortures, and to exchange the frightful death of burning alive, for the more merciful execution by the sword. Nay it even seems from the testimony of the truthful and noble hearted

Jesuit, Spee, that it was only certain degrees of torture that were supposed to render a confession involuntary, and that the minor or milder stages of the "question" elicited only *voluntary* acknowledgments of guilt. In his famous "*Cautio Criminalis*" he speaks as follows:

"But in further proof that they understand not, I refer to their usual mode and manner of speaking, when they say, that of the accused some had confessed to the sin of witchcraft without being submitted to the torture. For the like have I heard more than once with my own ears, and this, not only from judges and commissaries, but also from clergymen, and all these have I heard declare that such and such a one had freely and voluntarily acknowledged his sin, and therefore must be guilty thereof. Is it not indeed a matter of wonder, that men should make so evil a use of the gift of speech? For when I questioned them still further how and in what manner it had happened that these voluntary confessions were made, they acknowledged to me that the said individuals were indeed tortured, but only with the hollow or toothed leg screws (*Beinschrauben*, a species of engine resembling the Scottish "Boots"), on the shin bones! whereby on that tender part, the flesh and the bone is jammed together as it were into one mass, so that the blood spurteth out, and many hold that not the strongest man can withstand the same; and yet is this said to be a confession voluntarily made and without torture, and to this they subject the poor creatures, and write forthwith to their Lords and masters."

The uniformity of the confessions made by the witches has been already alluded to, but was this to be wondered at, when the confessions of the first tortured among the accused were bruited abroad, and when certain individuals who had long laboured under a suspicion of witchcraft, it was no marvel that the same were constantly indicated by the tortured prisoners as being their accomplices? We will again have recourse in confirmation of this to the unshaken testimony of Spee.

"A certain judge that I well know of, used constantly, when a prisoner having confessed her guilt, was interrogated regarding her accomplices, to ask her the following questions, if she persisted in saying that she knew of no others guilty like herself. Eh, dost thou not know A——? hast thou not seen *her* at the dance (The devil's sabbath)? And if she answer no, she knew nothing evil of that person, he exclaimed, 'Master,' (to the executioner) 'pull harder and screw up tighter.' And as the executioner did so, and the tortured person could withstand no longer for pain, but screamed out, Yes, yes, I know her, and that she had often seen her at the

dance, and begged that they would only let her down and she would confess all; he then caused this forced denunciation to be written down in the protocol, and then he continued: Dost thou not know B——? naming another, and hast thou not seen *her* at the like place? And if she denied the same, he again addressed the executioner and reminded him of his duty, and this lasted until B—— likewise was denounced, and so on until three or four others had been in like manner accused.”—*Cautio Criminalis*, Quæst. xxi.

Stricken with terror and amazement at these most unjudicial proceedings, the good Jesuit reduced the observations above noticed to paper, and communicated the whole history to an intimate friend, prior to laying it before his Prince. His friend, having perused the whole, returned the MSS. to Spee with the observation that he might strike out the examples he had given, for what need was there to bring forward examples of that which was now a daily practice?

“From hence we do conclude,” continues this good man, “that the commissaries (as I myself have observed) after the above described manner do question the accused not only concerning their accomplices, but likewise about their deeds, and the time and place of the holding of the dances, and this so clearly and regularly, that the words are put into the mouths of the accused, and all this they do to obtain greater glory with their masters and with men, for that the witches they have questioned have all confessed, and their testimonies have agreed.”—(*Cautio Criminalis*, l. c.)

It is obvious from the above extracts that no means of escape were open for those who fell under these terrible suspicions. To be suspected was to be guilty, for the object of the commissioners was not to judge of the truth or falsehood of an accusation of witchcraft; all they sought for was to elicit a confession, and the more the poor wretch denied the accusation, the more severely was she tortured, till many, we hope through the madness of despair, ended their lives by suicide in prison. Leubuscher strenuously maintains that too often actual insanity was produced by the long continued mental and bodily torments to which the accused were subjected.

“Abandoned, as they believed themselves to be, by God and man, objects of horror and detestation to the ignorant public, an enigma to themselves, tormented by their own morbid imaginations, by the terrors of the prison, of the rack, and of the executioner

and his assistants, having the fear of a dreadful death by fire on earth, to be exchanged for an eternal death in unquenchable flames hereafter, the unfortunate accused too often sank into a condition of mental confusion calculated to excite the deepest pity."—(Horst. *Dæmonomag.* Th. ii, p. 380.)

Let us for an instant place ourselves in the situation of one accused of witchcraft, let us abjure for the time being our superior enlightenment, in the gaining of which we have too often made shipwreck of our faith, let us place ourselves as in the middle ages, and give implicit credit to the then received doctrines of the mysterious and all pervading power of the devil, and we shall then be able, faintly indeed, to realize to ourselves the mental condition of a prisoner for imputed sorcery. Revenge, curiosity, or the morbid feelings of a depraved imagination, or flowing from a depraved life, may have originally led her to seek alliance with the dreaded fiends of hell, for all believed in those days, that a compact could be made with the evil one, and that by bartering the soul, the desired vengeance, or a temporal advantage could be obtained. Thus influenced, and thus morbidly excited, they practised the necessary incantations, with the details of which they had become familiar through listening with greedy ears to the confessions of others, and then fancying themselves irrevocably sold to the enemy of mankind, they plunged deeper and deeper into despair, till the constant image of their sin unsettled the mind, and real insanity ensued. That under such circumstances, many believed and voluntarily proclaimed their connexion with evil spirits, was only what would occur even at the present day, were the delusion regarding the prevalence of witchcraft as general now as it was two hundred years ago.

In addressing the general reader and not those only of our own profession, we are necessarily constrained to pass over many circumstances, which would greatly strengthen the opinions we hold upon the subject.

The records of the witch trials exhibit so fearful a picture of the most hideous passions, and pourtray in such abhorrent colours the debased condition of minds degraded by previous immorality, that often we must altogether withhold and abstain from noticing trials and confessions which otherwise would afford strong arguments in favour of our plea of insanity. But the evidence is often of so

gross and repulsive a nature that it cannot be called into court.

We have so long engaged the attention of our readers upon the general question, that small space is left us for the more special notice of the works we have proposed to review.

The work of Leubuscher is, as we have before said, an analytical history of the witch trials of the middle ages, investigating them chiefly by the light of medical science, while Soldan's history of the witch-processes is a more connected, more readable, but at the same time a more one-sided production.

The first case considered by Leubuscher, is the cold-blooded murder of Joan of Arc by the English commanders. The deeds of this noble-minded maiden were truly akin to the marvellous, yet our author is inclined to regard the exaltation of her mind as positive insanity. But in this instance at least, mania did not debilitate the intellect, but spurred on Joan to accomplish deeds almost superhuman. It is well known, however, that when the two great objects of her life, the liberation of the city of Orleans, and the crowning of the French King at Rheims were accomplished, her mission was complete, the mental excitement subsided, and she became feeble and vacillating in her counsels and in her actions, as she was before wise and resolute. Joan herself was no believer in magic, at least as regarded her own person, but it served the purposes of the English to indict her as a witch, and thus to consign the name of one who had broken the power of England to everlasting infamy. During her imprisonment Joan's excitement more than once returned, again she dreamed of battle fields and sieges, again she was visited in visions by the saints, but these hallucinations only furnished fresh materials for the malice of her implacable foes.

Our author next touches on the Waldensian heretics, and investigates the truth of the atrocities laid to their charge. Strange to say, though a Protestant, he is inclined to believe in the truth of these accusations, which Soldan indignantly denies, but he ascribes their deeds of darkness to the insane ferocity and superstition of a few individuals of that sect.

"The question is," says he, "whether lunatics really did exist

among the Waldenses, who believed that they held communication with the devil? Our answer is in the affirmative, and it is based, not only on the reports drawn up by the judges and inquisitors, but likewise upon the testimony of the Waldenses themselves. Many confessed to the murder of young children, and to the boiling down of their flesh to a species of hell-broth of which those present partook." "A woman," says Nider, "who was executed in Berne, made the following confession. We lie in wait particularly for unbaptized children, but not for these alone, especially when they are not guarded by the sign of the Cross, and we kill them while in the cradle, or lying by the side of their parents, by means of our words and ceremonies (incantations), so that people generally believe them to have been suffocated, or to have died a natural death. And then we steal them secretly out of the earth wherein they are laid, and boil them, till the flesh, after the bones are separated, is quite fluid, and may be drank as broth, and of the more solid parts we concoct a magic salve for our arts and transformations, but the fluid residue we put into flasks, and when a new comer hath drank a few drops thereof, he obtaineth a knowledge of our art."—(Nider, p. 717.)

Leubuscher believes such deeds to have been really perpetrated, and such may truly, in that rude and fanatic age, have been the case. But that real insanity was then probably present, we are inclined with our author to uphold, for even in these our enlightened days, and among men of education, we can bring forward examples, where monomaniacs have violated the sanctuaries of the dead, have torn open the grave, and revelled like Ghouls upon the decaying carcases.

Passing by the curious rabbinical traditions of the offspring of Adam and the evil spirit Lilith, which are given more completely by Soldan, we must likewise omit the notices of earlier tales and accusations of magic, to descend to the beginning of the fifteenth century. Although the belief in magic, sanctioned as it is by the authority of Scripture, has been almost universal from the earliest times, it does not seem to have taken its station as a great popular faith and outcry, until the middle of the fifteenth century. There can be no doubt that the publication of the bull of Innocent VIII., "*Summis desiderantes affectibus*," enormously augmented the popular terror and hatred of the black art of sorcery, but at the same time, this most curious document bears full testimony, that at this date, 1484, many learned clerics and laymen opposed with all their might the popular delusion, and were

in particular averse to the secular arm being employed to repress these supposed crimes. In judging of this bull of Pope Innocent, and of the prosecution that ensued, we must ever recollect, that in those rude days, the most cultivated intellects knew little of the wanderings and vagaries of the deranged and unsettled mind. When individuals of previously unblemished life and reputation came forwards, and under the influence in reality of temporary hallucination, acknowledged the commission of the most hideous crimes, it was scarcely to be expected that they, who knew nothing of the singular phenomena of monomania, should refuse to credit their confession, that they had dealings with the enemy of mankind. We enter, however, into no defence of Sprenger and Henricus Institoris, the authors of the *Malleus Maleficarum*, but we regard these men as types and consequences of the errors and delusions of the age, just as Luther and Calvin were, some twenty years later, the types of more serious and soul-destroying errors in matters of faith.

We have now arrived at the close of this eventful century, to enter upon one of infinitely greater importance in a religious point of view. The delusion of the direct influence of Satan was not the offspring of the brains of Inquisitors or Theologians, but the great intellects, who in that age mainly contributed to the spread of medical and legal science, led the way in maintaining and promulgating these doctrines. Ambroise Paré, the father of French surgery, and Fernelius, the renowned physician, may be cited as examples, and the latter has obtained an undying reputation by his researches and calculations as to the size and figure of the earth. "How then," asks Leubuscher, "could the herd of less instructed medical men come to any wiser decision, when these opinions were supported by authorities so decisive?" There is not an accusation, however absurd, that has been made against the witches, that is not corroborated and repeated by these otherwise undoubtedly great men. The medical profession, so generally reproached with incredulity, especially in regard to the spiritual world, has here shown itself more credulous than the theologians, for the latter were not illumined by the feeble rays which science shed over the world at that period. Still, even at that day, in the midst of the darkness and religious dissensions of the sixteenth century, there were men in all professions, who rose superior to

popular prejudice, and braved the popular hatred, by combating their favourite belief. Among these we may mention the Protestant physician, Weier, or Wierius, whose work contains much of what is good and sensible, but yet Weier fully believes in witchcraft, only that he at times elucidates certain cases that fell under his own observation by the light of medical science. Soldan would make Weier a hero, and the first who stood boldly forth against the witch mania; but the opinion of the more candid Leubuscher coincides with our own, that the work of Weier furnished more materials for further prosecutions against witches, than that it prevented the torture or saved any from the stake. The forcible arguments that Weier employed to prove that many cases were indeed only insanity and not sorcery, fell unnoticed by the world, while the portions of his work which treat of witchcraft as an acknowledged fact, were greedily caught up, as the forced confession of an unwilling witness of the truth.

"Weier indeed does not hesitate to ascribe most of the diseases which affect our frame to demoniacal agency, and he classifies the demons in their different ranks, and reckons them at many millions of evil spirits. 'Melancholia,' he observes, 'may be a true disorder, but, in general, it arises from the operation of evil spirits upon the brain; for,' observes he, 'the evil demons have a special liking to the *atra-bilis* of the human constitution. The convulsions of hysterical females originate likewise from the presence of the devil. All the singular sensations of which the possessed complain, do really exist, for the evil spirits cast themselves upon the senses, and the consequences of this their persecution are the more painful in proportion to the debility of the nervous system.'"—(Leubuscher, p. 51.)

Such are the boasted opinions of Weier, whom Soldan, in his bitter hatred against Catholicity, puts forward as the first champion who took the field against the witchmania, seeking thereby to tarnish the fair fame of the Jesuit, Friedrich Spee.

But, in sooth, Ponzinibius, Andreas Alciatas, and others, have far more title to this honour than the Protestant Weier. Ponzinibius was a lawyer of great and undoubted genius, and in his essay, "*De Lamiis*," he fearlessly canvasses the judicial proceedings of his times. He regards the honouring of the devil—devil worship, (*Teufels verehrung*), as a disorder of the intellect, and asserts, that

the *Lamiæ* (witches) who believe that they give themselves to Satan, are a prey to mere mental delusions. He maintains, too, that it is an act of fearful cruelty to condemn the insane to the stake, or to employ against them their own confessions, or to use these confessions for the prosecution of others. We are far, however, from refusing all honour to Weier, for the clear way in which he, in many instances, makes out a case of insanity where the patient was suspected of witchcraft, and for his earnest pleadings that the insane should not suffer with the guilty.

The diseases of the nervous system began now to be more carefully studied, and epilepsy, which from the time of the Romans, had been regarded as a diabolic disease, now took its proper place among nervous disorders.

Wonderful and great was, at this time, the terror of all civilized Europe concerning the doings of his satanic majesty; edict after edict was put forth against sorceries and witches, and judges vied with each other who should procure the greatest amount of victims. In the province of Lombardy, above 1000 processes were instituted against supposed witches, within twelve months, and one hundred victims, (not one thousand, as is generally stated,) perished at the stake within that period in the diocese of Como.

That the Inquisition, that tribunal so dreaded and abhorred by English Protestants, not unfrequently cited sorcerers and witches to appear before it, is well known; it was not to be expected that in that age, the members of that tribunal should be superior in intelligence to the *Paré's*, the *Fernelius's*, and others, whose whole lives were devoted to the investigation of the arcana of nature. And we can cite, even from the volumes before us, many instances where this supposed most sanguinary tribunal dealt with suspected witches far more leniently and cautiously than did the secular power. In the year 1511, the following occurred at Salamanca.

“A certain maiden of that city had devoted herself with so great enthusiasm to prayer and to godly practices, that she became a lunatic, and was afflicted with grievous hallucinations of the mind, and believed that Christ and our Blessed Lady were ever present, and kept up a constant conversation with her. She assumed the dress of the order of St. Dominic, and soon after gave herself out to be the actual spouse of Christ. In this capacity she believed that she was accompanied wherever she went, by Our Blessed Lady, so that when about to go into any house, she always drew back at the

door, as though to permit some one to pass in before her. On such occasions, she assured her friends, that Our Blessed Lady always besought her to enter first, and to take precedence, because she was the spouse of Christ. But the girl ever refused, saying, 'Oh, Blessed Lady, hadst thou not given birth unto Christ, he would never have been my husband, and it is but fit that the mother of my husband should take precedence of me.' The people of Salamanca believed the maiden to be inspired, and miracles were reported to have been wrought by her intercession. She was cited by royal mandate to Madrid, and examined by the Inquisition and by the papal commissioners, who found in her nothing of evil, but it was resolved to wait until time should unmask the real character of her delusions."—Llorente Hist. crit. d l'Inquisition, vol. i., p. 361.

Hallucinations of this precise nature are by no means uncommon at the present day, even among the bible-reading English, and we doubt much if the poor lunatic girl would have met with the same merciful treatment at the hands of our royal witch-finder, James the First.*

Even the Jesuits, the supposed incarnation of all that is cruel and malignant, are admitted by their worst adversaries to have shown at times wonderful tolerance in regard to accused witches. Bodinus relates, that in the year 1554, eighty maidens, who had recently been converted from the Jewish faith, and had received baptism, entertained and practised the delusion, that they had likewise received the gift of tongues. When they were exorcised by Bodinus, the devil answered through their mouths, that the other Jews, enraged at their conversion, had sent him into the souls and bodies of these damsels. And the worthy Bodinus hoped thereby to have obtained sufficient data to procure the burning of these wicked Jews. Fortunately

* A month or two ago, the writer of this review was visited by a female, of the middle ranks, who informed him, that her life was become a burden, for that she was possessed by the devil. We cannot enter into the details of her case, but it afforded a singular instance of the old doctrines of the Incubi and Succubi being yet in existence in this country. The woman, though a Protestant, told us that her only hope of cure was through the prayers of some Catholic priest, for that the devil had assured her, that it was they alone who were all-powerful against him.

Instances of a similar kind are not uncommon, and several curious cases are related by Leubuscher, in his pamphlet "*Grundzüge zur pathologie der psychischen Krankheiten.*" Berlin, 1848.

for the poor children of Abraham, a Jesuit stood forth and convinced the Pope that no man possessed the power of causing the devil to transmigrate into the body of a fellow mortal.

We now come to a period when a fearful revolution took place in religious belief, when the ties of family and of kindred were loosened and broken by differences of faith, and as a natural consequence, religious controversies and religious wars raged over the whole face of Europe. That the Evil One put forth his utmost powers at the epoch of the so-called Reformation, no Catholic will doubt, but the agitation of men's minds, the disunion, and above all, the highly extolled doctrine of private judgment in matters of faith which emanated from that unhappy period, was, we consider, amply sufficient to account for the great increase of hallucinations, especially in regard to demoniacal possession. The more we prove and test by the light of medical science, the individual cases that then appeared in such appalling numbers, the more clearly do the majority of the symptoms point to insanity as the origin of the delusions. We ourselves are fully prepared to admit to the fullest the doctrine of the existence of mental epidemics, and among the greatest of these we class the witchmania of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The leading men of the opposition to the Catholic Faith, Luther, Calvin, and Melancthon were all firm believers in witchcraft; and Luther himself gives in full detail, the history of his conversations and nocturnal conflicts with the devil. Amid the cases that in the fifteenth and the succeeding century crowd themselves upon our notice, it is no easy matter to make a judicious selection. There was but one point on which Catholics, Protestants, and Calvinists agreed, viz., the spread of witchcraft, and the necessity of employing the secular power to suppress it. Every town, every hamlet, swarmed with the supposed worshippers of the devil, who generally held his orgies on some high mountain or desert place in the vicinity. It is curious to remark, that while in Germany the Brocken mountain, one of the Hartz range, and in Sweden, a certain hill called Blockula, was the place honoured by his satanic majesty's throne, in France various spots were fixed on in the immediate vicinity of the towns where the witches were examined. Into the details of the witches' sabbath we forbear to enter, our pen refuses to trace the

picture of blasphemy and obscenity which is revealed by the forced confessions of the poor tortured prisoners, but which had no other existence than in their distempered brains. It is consoling, amid this almost universal darkness, to meet with the following enlightened observations of Pigray, the pupil of the superstitious Ambroise Paré, and one of the most celebrated surgeons of France, after the death of his great master. Pigray had been appointed, with Leroy and others, to examine the cases of fourteen supposed devil-worshippers, at Tours :

"We conversed with them," said he, "in various ways, as one is accustomed to talk with the insane, but we found them to be only poor stupid creatures, to whom death seemed a matter of indifference, and even by some to be desired. We came to the conclusion that it were better to fill them full of Hellebore, and thereby to purge them well, than to inflict punishment upon them, and the magistrates followed our advice."

It has been remarked by Calmeil, and corroborated by many others, that the hallucinations of supposed witchcraft frequently became infinitely more abundant after any great public calamity, and especially when famine or pestilence had appeared in the land. Protestant countries fared no better than Catholic. The exercise of the imitative faculty, so strongly developed in man, becomes morbid under the influence of a strongly excited imagination. Imitation is yet one of the most frequent modes in which hysteria first shows itself, and we believe that many cases of supposed demoniacal possession were propagated in like manner. A memorable example of this kind is given by Möhsen :

"In the year 1593, sixty individuals, and shortly after, one hundred and fifty, were possessed with the devil at Friedeberg, in the Neumark of Brandenburg. And these persons gave rise to great scandals in the churches, so that the preacher, Heinrich Lemrich, who had long conversed with these possessed persons, did suddenly in the pulpit behave like one possessed with an evil spirit, and was truly thought to be so, which caused the power of the Evil One to be more feared than ever. And on this account, it was ordained by the Protestant consistory there, that in all the churches of the Mark public prayers should be offered up, to free mankind from the power of the devil, but thereby was the evil not at all diminished, *it rather took on the form of a contagious disorder of the understanding.* When a possessed person appeared in any place, there soon came forth more afflicted in that way."

The history of the demonomaniacs of Lorraine is better known than many others to those who have read any of the ordinary works of witchcraft. The symptoms among the wretched women who on this celebrated occasion were tortured and burned, are precisely such as at the present day we observe among hysterical females, but increased and deepened in their hue by the prevailing delusion, and by the forced nature of the confessions extorted from them on the rack. Much, indeed, seems to have depended, even at this early period, upon the credulity or the caution of the judges and commissioners. While Remigius, in the excess of his blind zeal, was forcing the most revolting acknowledgments from the witches of Lorraine, other commissioners, more moved by mercy, or more enlightened by the dawn of science, dealt more sparingly with isolated cases. It is remarkable, that wherever the commissioners exercised extraordinary diligence, the number of witches augmented day by day, while when a wise and prudent man refused to entertain a case of alleged sorcery, or, having investigated it, declared the accused not guilty, we rarely find that the delusion spread, but on the contrary, rapidly subsided. As an example of this, we will extract from Leubuscher's work, the history of Martha Brossier, though it may be already partially known to some of our readers.

"In the spring of the year 1598, Martha Brossier, the daughter of a clothier at Romorantin, in Cologne, left her home, and wandered about, seeking spiritual aid, being, as she gave out, possessed by a devil, who caused her to fall into the most-fearful convulsions. The credulous people flocked about her by thousands. Miron, bishop of Angers, with the official commissioner of Orleans, carefully investigated her condition, and declared that she was not possessed by any devil, but that the whole was an imposture on her part. Following out this decision, he forbid, under pain of excommunication, any ecclesiastic in his diocese, or in the diocese of Orleans, to practise any exorcisms upon her. One of his experiments was, to give the girl a hearty meal, and then to present holy water to her; but the possessed remained unmoved, yet when the spring water was offered to her she became immediately and violently convulsed. Miron then ordered, in a loud voice, that they should bring him the book for exorcism, and began, in elevated and solemn tones, to repeat the first lines of the *Æneid*. The bait took, and the supposed possessed one increased her convulsive movements, as if the devil within her was mightily disturbed by the solemn exorcism. In Orleans the official placed before her a Lexicon, bound after

antique fashion. She regarded it as a work of sorcery, and shuddered at the mere aspect of the binding. They obliged her to read therein, and stumbling on some hard and obsolete words, she mistook them for the strongest forms of exorcism, and was terribly convulsed. In the spring of 1599, Martha Brossier came to Paris, and made a pilgrimage to the shrine of St. Genevieve. The Capuchins there regarded her as possessed, but the Cardinal of Gondi, then Archbishop of Paris, ordered the physicians Riolan, Marescot, and three others, to examine the case. (We pass over, as unnecessary, the strictly medical portion of the report.) The patient was tried with various questions in Latin and in Greek, (the devil, it was thought, spoke well all languages,) but she could not understand or respond. In a second examination, Duret, one of the physicians, pushed a needle deep into her hand, but she gave no sign of pain. At the third examination, Father Seraphim, the exorcist, exerted his utmost power, and Martha thrust out her tongue, rolled her eyes, trembled all over, and sprang with great jumps to the door of the Chapel. The victorious Father exclaimed, let him that yet doubts risk his life, and enter into combat with the devil! Marescot instantly accepted the challenge, seized the patient by the throat, and commanded her to be still. She instantly obeyed, and afterwards excused herself by saying that the evil spirit had at that very moment left her. At the fourth examination Martha remained still as long as the physicians were present, but the convulsions returned as soon as they concealed themselves; but when they reappeared, Marescot again produced a total calm."

The parliament of Paris, on Riolan's report, ordered her to be confined for forty days, and closely watched by a commission of fourteen doctors. The result was, that Martha was sent back to Romorantin, and placed under the superintendence of the police. But the people were not so easily quieted. The Government at length, through the Cardinal d' Ossat, laid the case before the Court of Rome, and the affair was not at rest until it became known that the Pope and his Cardinals took no part with Martha Brossier. We consider this female to have been throughout an impostor. We cannot even believe, that, like too many of her fellow-sufferers, she gave implicit credit herself to her being possessed by an evil spirit. A careful perusal of the whole reminds us strongly of the phenomena we have seen produced by the so-called art of Mesmerism, and which were suddenly arrested by the same rude means as were employed by Marescot. Man is ever prone to seek out the supernatural, and the mysterious, and the

place of the witches, and the possessed, is now occupied by the mesmerists and their dupes.

With the case of Martha Brossier we close the consideration of the witch trials of the sixteenth, and enter upon the (in this respect) still darker period of the seventeenth century. Mental disorders began now to be more closely studied, and their nature was carefully illustrated by Baillon, and especially by the celebrated Felix Plater. The latter was far beyond his age in medical science; but we yet see that he could not emancipate himself from its trammels altogether; he believes in witchcraft, and he carefully describes the symptoms of possession, giving for their recognition groups of symptoms which would now be regarded as indicating positive insanity.

We pass by the mournful histories of the witch trials in Germany, and in the Pyrenees, to call the attention of our readers to the singular and melancholy case of Louis Gaufridy, the aged parish priest in one of the Churches of Marseilles. On the accusation of two Ursuline Nuns, who, from their subsequent conduct, proved to be hysterical and insane, this most respected and beloved pastor was dragged before the Commissioner. Gaufridy was tortured in the most fearful manner, and at length condemned to the scaffold. It is reported by his adversaries, that poor Gaufridy made a voluntary confession of his iniquities; but if he did, and the fact is doubted by Soldan, he recalled it ere his death, and it was probably only wrung from him by excess of torture. If the Catholic Church has been blamed for judicial murders of this nature, it cannot at least be denied that she was eminently impartial in her punishments, since many priests, monks, and nuns, expiated their imputed crimes at the stake. Nor were these individuals, who, like Urbain Grandier, had rendered themselves obnoxious to the higher powers of the state, or of the Church; many were men and women of most blameless lives, beloved by their parishioners or fellow religious; and yet, on the accusation of one or two parties, they were dragged to prison, and the whole tide of popular fury was let loose on their devoted heads.

"When the wretched Gaufridy swore, by the name of God, by the Blessed Virgin, and St. John the Baptist, that the accusations against him were entirely false, Magdalene Mandouls, one of his accusers, replied, Yes, yes, I understand you well; that is the oath

of the synagogue. When you speak of God, you mean Lucifer, when of Christ, Beelzebub, when of the Holy Ghost, Leviathan; by the Blessed Virgin you understand the mother of Antichrist, and the Devil, the forerunner of Antichrist, is your John the Baptist."*

The demonomania, of the department of Labour, in the lower Pyrenees, was marked by similar credulity and obstinate blindness on the part of the Commissioner Delancré. This man seems to have been cruel, superstitious, and blinded to the last degree; yet he enjoyed, we believe, no small reputation as a jurist at Paris, and has left behind a detailed account of his proceedings in the most minute particulars of the investigation. We have no space for examining either Delancré's works, or the witch trials he superintended; but one instance of his mode of proceeding may suffice. Among the host of witnesses against the accused there appeared, as in the Swedish trials, a host of children, who deposed that they were constantly taken out of their beds at nights by witches in the shape of cats, and carried through the air upon the back of a goat to the witch's sabbath, where Satan himself presided in person. If the animal's back were not long enough to carry all the little wanderers, it was easily elongated by means of a spit inserted along the body of the poor goat. All these absurdities Delancré religiously received, and when it was urged that some of the children, from their extreme youth, were hardly worthy of credit, he replied, that the younger the children, the more important was their testimony; for in proportion to their youth, were they the more pure and uncontaminated by the world. On this occasion, too, the peasants, after detailing the revels at the witch sabbath, informed Delancré that the principal depot for the deadly poison employed by the magicians, was upon an almost inaccessible rock on the sea-shore, near Handaye. The Commissioners proceeded in a body to this desert spot, every inch of ground was carefully investigated in the course of two consecutive visits, but, as might be expected, nothing was discovered. Delancré relates this failure, but ascribes it to the agency of the devil. Leubuscher acknowledges that Delancré surpassed, by many degrees, in cruelty, the

* Leubuscher, p. 162.

fabled horrors ascribed to the Inquisition in its palmyest days.

Many of the witch-trials of their age contain confessions and accusations so gross, that they may not even be referred to in these pages; and for this reason we must pass over several, to arrive at the melancholy and well-known judicial murder of Urbain Grandier. This famous process occupies twenty pages in Leubuscher's work; and he endeavours to shew that Jeanne Belfiel, and the other Ursuline Nuns, who were Grandier's principal accusers, were in reality insane. Their delusions commenced, he thinks, by the simulations and contortions of hysteria; at a later period, irritation and excitement still more inflamed their imaginations, till they themselves believed that Grandier had exercised his demoniacal influence upon them, and then burst forth a storm of calumnies and imputations, so marvellous and so unconnected, that they can only have originated from distempered brains. Once that these false witnesses had testified, their testimony was held to be irrevocably good; and though the accusations were frequently recalled, though their convulsions were excited by the supposed, as well as by the actual presence of Grandier, all this availed nothing before judges, who, under the influence, it is supposed, of Cardinal Richelieu, were sworn to destroy the accused. It is said that Grandier had been discovered to be the author of a bitter and anonymous satire upon the Cardinal. That many, however, of the clergy and monks who urged on the trial and execution, really believed the accused to be a magician of the blackest dye, cannot, we think, for a moment be called in question. Father Lactantius, and Father Tranquillus, both died, not long after, completely insane. We cannot doubt that the minds of these credulous men, overwrought by the excitement of the trial, and by the hideous spectacle of the executions, at length gave way under the influence of the general delusion. If, however, it be true, as has been often asserted, that Father Lactantius acted not in good faith, but from a personal dislike to Grandier, then indeed was the murder of the accused terribly avenged. Within thirty days after Grandier was burned alive at Loudun, Father Lactantius expired in a fit of maniacal frenzy. It is said that Grandier threatened him on the scaffold with the wrath of God, and that ere long he would be called to an account for his misdeeds.

Father Tranquillus lived some time after, but likewise died insane. The excellent Surin, one of the most amiable and most pious of our spiritual writers, did not entirely escape. He had taken no part in the process against Grandier, but came to Loudun after the death of Father Lactantius. Fully impressed with the belief of that time, Surin proceeded to exorcise the possessed; but the excitement seems to have been too great for his gentle mind. Hardly a month had elapsed before the good father exhibited symptoms of mental derangement. He believed himself to have become possessed by the devil while exorcising the evil spirit out of the nuns of St. Ursula, and the delusion became so strong, that he was obliged to give up his pastoral duties, and was placed in a species of confinement. For many years afterwards he remained a prey to the most distressing nervous affection, which he ascribes, in his works, to the agency of the demon. But these were not the only victims of this terrible mental epidemic. The surgeon, Manouri, was one of the chief agents against Grandier.

"This man had greatly strengthened the testimony against the accused, by pretending to discover upon Grandier's body numerous moles, or marks, which, being insensible to the touch, were regarded as the marks of the devil, (*sigilla diaboli*.) In searching for the aforesaid marks he behaved with the greatest cruelty, piercing the body in many places so deep with a sharp probe, that the patient could not refrain from crying out. After the execution of Grandier, Manouri suffered much from the reproaches of his friends, and from the still more bitter testimony of his own conscience. One evening about ten o'clock, when he was returning from visiting a patient, accompanied by his assistant and another individual, he suddenly exclaimed, There, there comes Grandier! what does he desire of me? His friends conveyed him home, and placed him in bed; he trembled all over, and constantly saw before him the image of the murdered man, and after a few days of unutterable anguish, the unhappy man expired."*

It is a relief, indeed, to turn from the contemplation of these hideous proceedings, to the 20th chapter of Soldan's work. Of all the religious bodies that exerted themselves for the suppression of witchcraft, the Jesuits have been, by Protestant writers, the most severely handled, and the

* *Histoire des diables de Loudun*, 1716, p. 209.

most unsparingly condemned. That many of this noble order were carried along by the stream of popular delusion is certain; but that, on many occasions too, the much maligned Jesuits interfered, and saved innocent lunatics from the stake, is conceded by both Catholic and Protestant writers. Even Soldan, embittered as he is against the Catholic Church, and the professors of our holy faith, dares not refuse the full meed of praise that is due to one of that persecuted society, for his exertions to arrest the fearful progress of the witchmania.

In the year 1631, there appeared at Rintel, a work entitled, "*Cautio Criminalis; seu de processibus contra sagas, &c., &c. Auctore incerto Theologo Orthodoxo,*" which excited great attention. At first the author seems to have been unknown; but it was discovered to be the saintly Jesuit, Friedrich Spee, whose merits as a missionary were less known to the world than the beautiful poems in which he has sung the praises of God. Friedrich Spee, of the noble house of Langenfeldt, was born in 1591, at Kaiserswerth, in the district of Cologne, and became an alumnus at the Jesuit college at Cologne, in 1610. After his ordination as priest, Spee was employed in various parts of Germany as a missionary; and it is said that he was so successful in this work, that within the space of a few months he converted the whole of the town of Peina, in Lower Saxony, to the Catholic faith. His success excited the fury of the Protestant party, and a Lutheran of Hildesheim attempted to assassinate the holy man, leaving him for dead, with seven wounds in divers parts of the body. God, however, preserved his servant for further trials, and when the plague broke out among the soldiers at Treves, in 1635, Spee was everywhere to be seen, succouring both the souls and bodies of the afflicted, till, having himself taken the disease, he closed his life on the 7th of August of that year, a sacrifice to his charitable and heroic exertions. As a sacred poet Spee ranks among the first of Germany, evincing the utmost command of language, with the noblest and most exalted feeling of the beauties of natural scenery; while throughout all his verses runs the never varying, and yet never wearying theme, the praise of the Creator in his marvellous works. We could devote a volume to the consideration of the poetry of this good man; but our business here is to consider his prose, as put forth in the caus-

tic pages of the *Cautio Criminalis*. It would appear at first sight impossible that one whose poems breathe throughout the deepest humility, and the most unalloyed sweetness of disposition, could have indited the nervous paragraphs and caustic satire of this celebrated work.

The great Leibnitz has left us the following sketch in his *Theodicee*, vol. i., pp. 96 and 97.

"This great man (Spee) held in Franconia the office of Confessor at the time that many persons were accused and burned for witchcraft in the Bamberg and Würzburg districts. John Philipp of Schönborn, afterwards bishop of Würzburg, and finally Churfürst of Mayence resided then as a young canon in Würzburg, and was on terms of the most intimate friendship with Spee. One day the young canon asked the worthy father why his hair had become prematurely grey, and Spee answered, that this was to be ascribed to the witches whom he had accompanied to the scaffold. Schönborn was greatly surprised at this reply, but Spee soon solved the enigma. Throughout the whole of his career as a Confessor, he had, he said, met with no single case in which he could believe that the accused person was guilty of the crime of magic. Many simple individuals had at first confessed to him, as their spiritual director, that they were really guilty of what was laid to their charge, influenced by the fear of a repetition of torture if they denied the accusation. But when they discovered that they had nothing to fear from their Confessor, they had become more confident, and had entirely changed their tone. With lamentable sighs and groans they had all and each one deplored their miserable condition, and the ignorance or malice of their judges, and in their last moments had called upon God to witness their innocence. The repetition of the dreadful scenes had so deeply impressed the tender heart of Spee, that his hair became grey while he was yet young."

It is true that Spee published anonymously his *Cautio Criminalis*, but it cannot be maintained, as Soldan would infer, that he was not known to be the author; for Massenius expressly states that he was exposed to no small trouble for having printed a work without the approbation of his superiors.

We have already, in former pages of this Essay, given an extract or two from Spee's work; but they will hardly convey to the reader the sharp and cutting tone in which he reproves the disorders of the epoch in which he writes. In the bitterest words he exposes the superstition and prejudices of the common people; the ignorance, avarice, and

contradictions that prevailed amongst the judges, the levity and indifference of the Governments, and the fanatical spirit of many of the clergy. We have space only for an extract from his 51st question as to the mode in which the processes were then conducted. After relating the preliminary forms, if they really deserve the name, he proceeds to the consideration of the torture.

"When, therefore, the witch hath been duly singed and shaved, she is straightways tortured, to make her tell the truth, that is, to make her confess herself a witch at once. She may deny it if she please, but her denial is a falsehood, and *cannot* be the truth. And first they torture her after the worst fashion, whereby perhaps you would understand they apply the severest punishments the first; but no, it is but termed the worst in comparison to the better and more complete torments that are to follow. And if now the witch doth at once confess, it is all right, and they give out that she has confessed of her own free will. And how can a prince or magistrate overlook such a testimony? how can he refuse to believe such and such a one to be a witch, when she has acknowledged voluntarily her crime? So then people give themselves no further trouble about the matter, but hurry her away to death, as they would likewise have done if she had not confessed at all; and in truth it doth therefore seem that when once the torture is commenced, the game is won, the poor wretch must in any case die. Confess she, or confess she not, it is all the same. Doth she confess, the matter is clear, and she must be executed, for recalling of her word availeth not; doth she prove obstinate, then is she tortured a third and a fourth time, for the commissioner hath power to ordain, in this regard, what he wills, and hath no fear of being called to account for excess of torture. Should the witch, when tortured, roll her eyes, or stare with open orbs, these are new 'indicia' of guilt; for the bystanders exclaim, 'Behold, she looks after her familiar spirit!' When she stares wildly she seeth him, and if she persisteth in her denial, she is tortured more sharply than ever. And should she under such pains contort her face, or should she faint away, then do they say she smileth or sleepeth on the rack, or she hath taken something to prevent her confessing her guilt, and therefore must she be burned alive, as has happened to several of late. And if it should chance that she dieth upon the rack, they maintain that the devil hath broken her neck. And forthwith cometh Master Jack Ketch, ('Hans Knüpfau', 'Jack tie-him-up,') and drags forth the corpse, and buries it beneath the gallows. Should the poor wretch meet with a judge so merciful as that he will not condemn her to the stake without confession of her guilt, she doth not escape, but is forthwith thrust into a deeper and a

darker prison for a year or more, there to rot in filth till her heart be more tender.

"And now (God alone knoweth,) I would fain know how any mortal can escape or free himself from the like toils, as it is certain that both they who confess, and they who do not confess, must alike suffer death. O most miserable witch! What didst thou hope for? Why didst thou not acknowledge thy guilt as soon as thou wert brought into prison? Oh most foolish woman! Why wouldst thou die so often, as then thou wouldst have had to die but once? Follow my advice, say at once you are a witch, and die, for in vain dost thou hope for freedom. The law in Germany knoweth of no such words."

We dare not detain our readers longer upon the merits of this excellent man: The *Cautio Criminalis* was greedily read, and much good, no doubt, ensued from its publication; but the world was as yet not sufficiently enlightened to break through the dense barrier of popular ignorance on this subject. Towards the end of the seventeenth century, the belief in witchcraft rapidly lost ground, yet executions frequently took place. The famous process of Mora, in Sweden, occurred in the year 1669, the witch trials in England and Scotland still went on, and the last execution for witchcraft in the latter country took place at Dornoch, in Sutherland, in the year 1729.

In 1693, Balthasar Bekker, a pastor of the Reformed Church at Amsterdam, published his famous work, "*De Betoverde Weereld*,"* which was immediately translated into various languages, and contributed immensely to the suppression of the witchmania.

In the commencement of the succeeding century Christian Thomasius put the finishing stroke to this hideous delusion, in his celebrated "*Theses Inaugurales*." Both Bekker and Thomasius were Protestants; but though their works were more generally read, we doubt, if in sharpness of criticism, and bold opposition to prevailing doctrines, they can be reckoned with the *Cautio Criminalis*.

The last execution for witchcraft, among the Catholics of Germany, was the case of the aged nun, Maria Renata, at Wurzburg, in 1749. The whole process is given by Soldan, and it is one worthy of the darkest periods of the witchmania; but a full equivalent to this disgraceful

* The Enchanted World.

affair may be found in the process and decapitation of Anna Göldli, by the Protestants of Glarus, in 1782. There are men yet living in that town who remember this last judicial murder for sorcery; and though in various remote districts the belief in witchcraft still lingers, we may, thank God, regard the witchmania as totally extinct. Mental epidemics have since arisen of various kinds, but the light thrown upon the real nature of hallucinations and of insanity, has for ever extinguished the torch of persecution for magic and witchcraft.

It is, in our opinion, an act of the grossest injustice to attempt to lay the witchmania to the charge of either the Catholic Church, or of the numerous Protestant sects. All religions, all sects, prosecuted to the death the supposed witches; all were intimately convinced of the reality and of the positive existence of the crime of magic. Many bad men, it is true, availed themselves of the popular credulity, in this regard, to further their own designs of avarice or revenge; but it is impossible to rise from the perusal of the witch processes without being convinced that the majority of the Commissioners, Inquisitors, Pastors, Jurists, and Physicians, who took part in these mournful trials, were fully impressed with the idea that they were promoting the glory of God, and resisting, as by conscience obliged, the works of the Spirit of Darkness.

The progress of humanity, and the greater perfection of our laws, have abolished the once universal application of the torture in criminal cases; the progress of medical and chemical science, and a more complete acquaintance with insanity and hysteria in their various forms, have destroyed the calling of the magician, and turned his art to ridicule; but while we plume ourselves upon the superior enlightenment of our age, let us not forget that mental epidemics will again prevail, and let us humbly pray, that whatever character they may assume, the children of God's Church may be mercifully preserved from their influence.

ART. III.—*Vermischte Schriften von Karl Ernst Jarcke.* (Miscellaneous Writings, by Charles Ernest Jarcke, Doctor in Philosophy and Law.) 3 vols. Munich. 1839.

NEXT to Theology and Philosophy there is not a more important science than that of public, and more particularly Constitutional Law. The ignorance of speculative, as well as practical politics, is, in men of rank and station, often productive of great detriment and misfortune to the State, especially in times of great political commotion. Melancholy examples might be cited from the history of the French Constituent Assembly of 1789, and more particularly of the Spanish Cortez of 1812, where, from ignorance, respectable Catholics were led away by revolutionary sophisms, and so by degrees became instrumental in the work of religious and social destruction.*

The study we speak of is most necessary to the peer, the country gentleman, the magistrate, the lawyer, and the clergyman, and the higher classes of electors, whose responsibilities, of course, increase, with the measure of their knowledge, and the circumstances of their condition. It is superfluous to observe, that without a due knowledge of the theory of Political Science, no great statesman can be formed. And though good sense and habits of business, will enable a member of the Legislature to go through his duties in a respectable manner, yet how much will good

* The French nobles and clergy who in 1789 quitted the sittings of their respective orders, and joined the Tiers-Etat, committed an error from which all the subsequent political acts of the revolution were necessary corollaries; for they substituted for the old Constitution of States the chaos of revolutionary anarchy. The first cry of that revolution, destined to be so fatal to religion and her ministers, was "Vivent les Curés."

In Spain, it was the Moderados, headed by Martinez de la Rosa, who confiscated the property of the Church.

In both the historical instances we have cited, we feel persuaded that the error of many individuals engaged in these transactions, proceeded, especially in the first case, more from ignorance and vanity than from a deliberate hostility to the Church and to the monarchy. Yet surely this was a culpable ignorance.

sense be sharpened and elevated, how much will experience be informed and enlarged, by a comprehensive investigation of domestic and foreign politics. The sages and lawgivers of ancient Greece were not content with studying the laws and political institutions of her different States, various and dissimilar as they were, but undertook long and painful journeys to examine those of Asia Minor, Egypt, and even Persia. How much more necessary is such a comparative study to modern statesmen, since the different European kingdoms and states stand in such close connexion, religious, political, and commercial, with each other. In all departments of human activity, the bulk of mankind is incompetent to appreciate theory, but must be content to follow the routine of practice. And the science of politics forms no exception.

But if the ruling classes of society be always called upon to pay attention to the fundamental principles of legislation, how much more is such attention requisite in periods of revolutionary ferment, when ancient political systems are sifted to their bottom, when anti-social doctrines undermine the foundations of society, and the theory of revolt is so quickly followed up by practical insubordination. When the dictates of duty only should be consulted, must chance, favour, connexion, and self-interest, determine our course of action?

How critical, too, at all times, and more especially in periods of political commotion adverted to, is the condition of a Catholic minority in a Protestant country, like our own, where the foreign and domestic policy of our rulers may happen, and has at times happened, to be repugnant to justice, adverse to the interests and liberties of the Catholic Church, and injurious to the moral and material well-being of our own country!

The system of hereditary politics, which has prevailed in the great families of England, as in those of ancient Rome, is admired by Niebuhr, who thinks it has not a little contributed towards the stability of the British Constitution. Much, doubtless, may be alleged in its favour; but the advantages of such a system apply only to the ordinary routines of political affairs, where no great questions of religion, social order, and international justice are involved. Thus among the great aristocratic houses of this country, which, with few exceptions belonged to the Anglican communion, religious dissent did not intervene

to inflame political differences. And in the more peaceful times of the eighteenth century, momentous questions of constitutional policy were rarely agitated in the British Senate.* No organized party of destruction existed in the country, or was represented in Parliament; and abroad, no revolutions convulsed society, disturbed the balance of power in Europe, and so afforded to the Protestant State of England a motive or a pretext for interfering in the internal concerns, religious and political, of Catholic countries.

But far otherwise hath it been since that fatal year, 1789, which ushered in the era of storms. Thenceforth the old trade-winds of constitutional politics have given way to the more violent blasts which have blown from every point of the political compass, and defied the calculations of the most experienced pilots. Hence the old party tactics, that belonged to the exclusively Protestant parliament of the last century, became inapplicable to the more mixed legislature of the present times,—a legislature, too, be it remembered, on whose decisions, (from the peculiar posture of European politics in this age, as well as from the great power of our country,) depends the weal or woe of entire nations, and the solution, good or evil, of the most momentous problems of civilization. Hence the impossibility of a conscientious Catholic following implicitly or unreservedly in such a parliament, the system of hereditary, or family politics. Hence the serious responsibility which, especially in critical times, like the present, attaches to the British Catholic, whether as an elector or a senator, in the execution of his political duties. Hence, too, the duty imposed on the higher classes, and especially

* This expression must, of course, be understood in a relative or modified sense; for during the last century, England was not exempt from all political commotions. The question, however, which most agitated our country in the last age,—the pretensions of the House of Stuart to the throne,—was one which on the whole remained external to Parliament; and, however important, involved rather dynastic interests than fundamental points of constitutional policy. Yet even on this question Catholics could not remain neutral. The interests of their Church, and old hereditary feelings of loyalty, as well as the sufferings and persecution they had to endure from the new dynasty, induced many of them to give their support to the Jacobite party.

the clergy, or at least a portion of their body, of devoting some attention to the study of civil government.*

But when we recommend the study of political science, we, of course, understand, a science based on sound religious and social principles; for a vicious theory perverts practice, and is worse than none at all. But how are we to know what is a vicious theory? For a Catholic, the standard is not far to seek. Political, like every other branch of ethical science, hath its roots in revelation,—that is, in Scripture and Tradition, transmitted and interpreted by the Church. Where the Church hath not pronounced a formal dogmatic decision, her spirit is evinced in her practice, or in the more general teaching of her doctors; and where these are silent, or divided in opinion, the other data of political science must be sought for in the general sense and experience of mankind, the traditions of nations, and the analogies of reason. Such are the elements of the science of legislation, such the primary and secondary principles that must guide the Publicist in the construction of his theories. But two things are here to be observed. The first is, that saving certain fundamental points, the Catholic Church allows in politics the fullest freedom of opinion; more so, indeed, than in any other department of ethics. The second is, that like all the moral sciences, so especially is the science of legislation not always susceptible of rigid formulas of reasoning; for much must here be left to feeling and experience.

Having thus pointed out the importance of this study, we shall now, before reviewing the work at the head of our article, proceed to give an account of the most eminent Publicists who, within the last sixty years, have combated revolutionary errors, and so, in a greater or less degree, helped to bring about a Catholic regeneration of political science.

The founder of the modern anti-Jacobin school was our illustrious countryman, Edmund Burke, that great doctor, whom we do not hesitate to say, Providence raised up to combat the political heresies of his day.† Even in re-

* In Catholic Universities there are always some ecclesiastical students, who follow a course of the *Jus Publicum*.

† His youthful admirer and follower, George Canning, addressed

ligion, we scarcely know any protestant of former times, except Grotius, Leibnitz, and some of the great Anglican Divines of the seventeenth century, who have spoken in a more kindly, and even reverential tone of the Catholic Church and her ministers, than Edmund Burke.* And this is one of the reasons why his political writings came to exert an influence in Catholic Europe, such as the more frigid productions of the Anglican Tories have never been able to acquire.

This illustrious man brought to the defence of social order the fruits of long political experience, acquired in one of the most celebrated schools of modern statesmanship;—a genius eminently sagacious and observant, enriched and invigorated by ancient literature, and modern historical knowledge, and an eloquence, fervid, teeming, and splendid, which has not been surpassed, and rarely equalled by any of his successors. Nor is it true, as we have sometimes heard it stated, that this great man refuted only the grosser errors of Jacobinism. First, his genius was more practical than metaphysical; and consequently that rich treasure of moral and political observations, which lie scattered through his writings, was not reduced to a systematic form. Next, he was a protestant, and therefore though on many points he looked with a favourable eye on our Church, he could not of course grasp all the deep latent causes of that awful moral and political malady which filled his declining years with anguish and dismay. Lastly, he was a statesman of the eighteenth century, and on that account rather inclined to over estimate material prosperity, as the test of national greatness. Yet he saw that the irreligious philosophy of the last age was the main cause of that dreadful Revolution, which he analysed with so much skill. Nay, he

him in 1796, as one, “Born to instruct, delight, and mend mankind.” Alas! that Canning had always been mindful of the lessons of his great master!

* Burke persuaded, or tried to persuade himself, that the great doctrines which divided the various Christian Churches, were mere scholastic opinions, and that on all fundamental articles those Churches were agreed. This was the fatal seductive theory of fundamental points, on which so many eminent protestants have split.

goes further ; and the Latitudinarianism and Socinianism, which after their dispersion through Europe had crept in among the French protestants, he assigns as the cause of the coalition of the immense majority among them with the French Jacobins. Who has ever shown, too, better than he, the utility, nay, the necessity of an independent Church for the maintenance of social order, and the protection of freedom ? The encroachments of the Emperor, Joseph II. on the ecclesiastical and political liberties of his subjects, he called *Jacobin innovations*,* and remarked how they facilitated the conquests of the French revolutionary armies in the Netherlands. And with regard to the political causes of the Revolution of 1789, he was not insensible to the dangers of a too numerous body of functionaries. The utmost contempt did he profess for those "creatures of the desk," as he calls them,† dead alike to high generous feelings, and incapable of grasping mighty principles, and who in the latter part of the last century, drew the French government into perilous innovations at home, and urged it into ambitious enterprises of aggrandizement abroad. Yet what would he have said, had he seen the gigantic power which Bureaucracy has attained to in modern France, in Austria, and still more in Prussia, and the minor States of Germany—a Bureaucracy which has been the Church's most deadly enemy, which has usurped the functions of the natural, legitimate aristocracy, flattered royalty in the moment of prosperity, and sometimes betrayed and deserted her in the hour of need ?

On the various elements of the mixed monarchy, and the relations between royalty, aristocracy, and democracy, Burke entertained the soundest notions. In the first he saw the key-stone of the political edifice ; in the second the column that imparted to it solidity as well as grace, and in the last the strong enduring buttresses, that upheld the structure. He never would have lent his countenance to those sham monarchies, those parodies on the British Constitution, in which the ties of interest and sentiment between the upper and lower Houses are dissevered ;—the clergy not only unrepresented in parliament, but unen-

* See his Letters on a Regicide peace.

† See his Letters on a Regicide peace.

dowed, and reduced to a miserable state stipend; and where a despotic, centralizing administration usurps all the functions of free municipal government. Mixed monarchy, he undoubtedly advocated; but a monarchy, where, as in the old *States-Constitutions*, royalty retained the supremacy, or where, as in the British Constitution of 1688, aristocracy was lord of the ascendant. To the commonalty he was for assigning a due share of power; and its political functions he regarded as no less conducive to the cause of order, than of liberty. And on this very point, indeed, he has evinced more discernment than several of his distinguished successors. It is needless to add, that this great man was not only the warm friend of religious toleration, but was for conceding full liberty to the Catholic Church in her internal administration.

As in the midst of the struggle against the French Revolution this illustrious writer was called away, his mantle fell on the Baron von Gentz, who in many respects became to Germany what Burke had been to England—an oracle of political wisdom, and the soul of the Anti-Gallic Alliance.* Gentz, without the lofty eloquence and profound wisdom of our great countryman, united extraordinary knowledge and political sagacity, to a clear, animated style.

To the principles of the Revolution, indeed, he offered but a negative opposition; but he has the immense merit of having been among the first to combat with energy those doctrines, as well as having in the character of a publicist and a diplomatist alike, zealously promoted the cause of German independence.†

Just as our great luminary, Burke, was about to set, two stars of the first magnitude rose above the dark, tempestuous horizon of France; Count Maistre, and the Viscount de Bonald. The first, though a native of Savoy, may

* Gentz translated Burke's "Reflections on the French Revolution" into German, with notes. He was also sent on a diplomatic mission to our country, where he had an important conference with Mr. Pitt.

† Baron Gentz had under Prince Metternich a principal share in the direction of Austria's foreign policy. He was a protestant; but as we have heard from persons acquainted with him, he entertained kindly feelings towards the Catholic Church.

from the language in which he wrote, the peculiar turn of his mind, and the influence he has exerted over the French public, be classed among Frenchmen. To a noble character, and generous enthusiastic faith, Count Maistre joined the charms of the most brilliant wit, fervid eloquence, the most varied learning, the utmost cogency of reasoning, and an almost intuitive profoundness of observation. Of his transcendent merits, both as a theologian and a metaphysician, it is not our business here to speak; for it is with the publicist only we have now to deal. It is especially in his two admirable essays, entitled "*Considérations sur la Révolution Française*," and "*Esprit générateur des Constitutions politiques*," that this great man combated *ex professo*, the principles of the French Revolution; but his larger works, "*Du Pape*," and "*Les Soirées de St. Petersburg*," teem (among other things) with a rich variety of political remarks. The metaphysical errors of the Revolution, which Burke had for the most part left untouched, this great writer probed to the quick. The divine origin of the civil power, as proclaimed by Christianity, he ably defended against the revolutionary sophists, showing how political society was an evolution from domestic society, and political authority a development of domestic power. Nay, he went further;—and affirmed that all political constitutions are in a certain sense *divine*; for they are the result of time, circumstances, and events, over which man has no control. He asserts that the excellence or the viciousness, the durability or the instability of a Constitution depend on its adaptation to the religion, manners, population, geographical situation, and political and commercial relations of a people; and as these a nation has received and not created, and as they are mostly independent of its will and control, it follows that a sound political Constitution is not a human, but a providential work.

Count Maistre, though in his ardent polemics against the French Revolution, he was too much biassed in favour of absolute royalty; yet in other places expresses his regret at the suspension of the old states-general of the French monarchy; and more than once pronounces his admiration for the British constitution. No one, too, abhorred more strongly than he, the excesses of regal despotism, as well as those attendant on popular licentiousness. Hence the zeal with which he defended the

Papal umirage of the middle ages, as the institution best calculated to promote the harmonious development of order and liberty in each state, as well as to preserve peace and a good understanding among different nations. On the whole, however, this eminent publicist is more successful in refuting the theoretical errors and sophisms of the Revolution, than in suggesting remedies for preventing or counteracting its practical evils.

Simultaneously with his illustrious friend Count Maistre, the Viscount de Bonald came forth on the stage of public life. Inferior to the former in learning, and in depth and comprehensiveness of genius, M. de Bonald was still pre-eminently distinguished for force of reasoning, solidity of judgment, profoundness of observation, and dignity of style. In metaphysics this great philosopher solved with brilliant success the most arduous problems, especially that of the divine origin of language, and that of the spirituality of the soul, while his writings display in general great knowledge of the human heart.

As a publicist (and this is the light in which we have here principally to consider him), M. de Bonald ably pointed out the analogies in the constitution of the state and of the family, showing how the authority of the father, the tender ministrations of the mother, and the obedience of the child, correspond to the mutual relations of royalty, nobility, and the people. *Le Pouvoir, le Ministre, le Sujet*—this triple element, he shows, pervades these two forms of social existence. His fundamental maxim in politics, "Monarchy in the constitution, democracy in the administration," is a proposition which, with some limitations, is entitled to general acceptance. This maxim the French Revolution reversed, as it established despotism in the administration, and democracy in the constitution. We said, *with some limitations*, the proposition of M. de Bonald was to be received: for, under the temperate Christian monarchy, the element of democracy must to a certain extent enter into the constitution itself. Warmly as this eminent publicist advocated municipal institutions, he yet did not sufficiently appreciate the states-constitution. Like his friend, Count Maistre, he had been a victim of the French Revolution, had witnessed all the sacrilegious abominations and bloody atrocities which it gave rise to, and therefore from the frightful abuse of popular institutions, was inclined to look upon all legislative assemblies

with distrust and aversion. Moreover, though a most thoughtful observer of human society, this distinguished philosopher had neglected historical studies. He wanted the learning which qualifies too broad and sweeping statements; and therefore although his general propositions be almost always just and profound, he yet is not equally successful in applying them to details.

M. de Bonald was one of the purest and noblest characters, as well as distinguished intellects that France has produced in latter times; and the most exalted sentiments, as well as the warmest attachment to the Catholic Church pervade his writings.* To this writer, as well as to his illustrious compeers, M. de Maistre, and the abbé de la Mennais (prior to his unhappy fall), we owe a lasting debt of gratitude for the moral edification, and the mental discipline, which our youth derived from the perusal of their immortal works.

While these great French philosophers were thus courageously standing up against the torrent of revolutionary principles, Germany was not wanting in noble champions of the same holy cause. Endowed with a genius not less profound than Count Maistre's, and more versatile and comprehensive, enriched, too, with all the resources of a boundless erudition, Frederick von Schlegel treated political science with the same superiority, as every other department of moral philosophy. Through his various works, "*Modern History*," "*Philosophy of History*," "*Philosophy of Life*," and more especially, his *Journal* entitled, "*Concordia*," his political views are to be found scattered. There are, according to this illustrious philosopher, five great corporations—the family—the church—the state—the guild—and the school. As it is only with the author's political philosophy we have here to deal, we shall confine our remarks to his views on the state. "Between the family" (says his biographer, who analyses his political system), "Between the family—the smallest and simplest of all corporations, the ground-work of the others—and the church, that high, expansive and luminous vault above,

* The chief works of M. de Bonald are "*Theorie du Pouvoirs civils et religieux*," (1796), *Legislation Primitive* (1802), *Divorce* (1806), *Melanges et Pensées* (1817), and *Recherches Philosophiques* (1818).

stands the state." The State Schlegel defines an "Institution armed for the maintenance of peace." Its existence, says he, is bound up with all the other corporations; it lives and moves in them; they are its natural organs; and as soon as the state, whether with despotic or anarchical views, attempts to impede the natural functions of these organs, to disturb or derange their peculiar sphere of action, it impairs its own vital powers, and sooner or later prepares the way for its own destruction.*

The five corporations we have named are essential and immutable, but each of them has subordinate institutions or corporations, variable and accidental in their nature, and destined to fulfil the special ends and objects of each. These it is the paramount duty of the state to protect. The latter contains within itself a multitude of Corporations, on whose due development depends its stability, as well as freedom. The clergy in its spiritual relations is independent of the temporal power: but in its civil relations, it is a member of the state. The clergy together with the *school*, which is a subordinate, dependant corporation, represents the intelligence of a state; the nobility its outward energy; and the people with the guild, which is the intermediate corporation between the family and the state, symbolizes the powers of production.

The state, according to F. Schlegel, is a physical being, subject to the natural laws of birth, growth, maturity, and decay; but it is a physical being swayed by the action of intelligence, composed as it is of free, rational agents. The accustomed laws, too, of this physico-intellectual being are overruled by the special agency of divine providence, as well as by the influences, salutary or pernicious, of good and evil spirits.

Not content with merely refuting revolutionary principles, Schlegel opposed to them a compact body of positive doctrines. Beside the shapeless ruins which the Revolution had left everywhere in its course, he pointed out the magnificent structure of the free temperate monarchy, that the Church had erected in the Middle Age, but whereof the Reformation had prevented the completion. The various occupations, however, of this no less versatile than profound genius, prevented him from giving to his political doctrines their full development. This task was

* See Robertson's Life of F. Schlegel.

reserved for another great contemporary—the illustrious Görres, of whom we shall now say a few words.

Extensive learning, a rich imagination, profound understanding, and fiery eloquence, characterized this remarkable man. To politics and history he devoted for many years his chief attention, and therefore he has investigated with great minuteness and accuracy all the component elements of the Christian state. He has the merit of having shown with great skill how the mediæval temperate monarchy could be adapted to the wants and circumstances of the present time. Agreeing with all the great Catholic Conservatives on the fundamental points of policy, he has ably set forth the nature of the relations, that should subsist between the church, royalty, aristocracy, and the commonalty: and especially demonstrated the usefulness of the democratic element as a principle of stability, no less than of progress. All the political errors of our time—the doctrine of popular sovereignty—the subordination of the Church to the state—the total separation of Church and state—the Bureaucratic absolutism—the revolutionary democracy—in a word, the doctrines of political rationalism, have found in Görres their most formidable adversary. In short, when we consider the soundness of his doctrines, the depth and comprehensiveness of his views, the solidity of his judgment, and the extent of his learning, we should say that, as a political writer, Görres has never been surpassed.

Prior to the two illustrious Germans we have named, a distinguished Swiss writer rendered the greatest services to the cause of order and liberty. Endowed with a clear, sagacious intellect, invigorated by extensive learning, Lewis von Haller has devoted his exclusive energies to the science of public law; and his great work entitled, “Restoration of political science,” has formed an epoch in that department of learning. A grandson of the celebrated physiologist, Albert von Haller, our publicist, too, treated with the same originality, what may be called the *physiology of the state*. The rise, growth, and expansion of civil societies—the legitimacy of property—the evolution of royalty from domestic authority—the character of the various forms of government—the universality and the necessity of nobility—the limits and the conditions of personal freedom—are all set forth by him with remarkable clearness of reasoning and extent of learning.

The greater part of his important work—"the Restoration of Political Science"—Haller wrote, while he was still a protestant, and consequently less competent to take an unbiassed, comprehensive view of all political and social questions. Hence the higher, more spiritual elements of politics—such as the influence of the Church on society, the mutual relations of Church and State, and the rest—were not so vividly present to the mind of our republicist as those inferior, more earthly conditions and relations, which attach to the state as a physical being. We say, *not so vividly present*; for every page of Haller's work reveals a religious-minded man; and it was, indeed, his Christian sincerity, that, under God, was the means of bringing him to the true Church.

Besides the defect we have mentioned, this publicist falls occasionally into other faults—the result of a too systematic theorizing—and does not sufficiently appreciate the action of democracy in the monarchical system. On the whole, Haller has treated the science of public law with more method and copiousness, than any other modern writer; and if he did not equal some of his great Catholic contemporaries in profoundness and comprehensiveness of intellect, he is inferior to none in judgment and practical sagacity.*

Dr. Jarcke, whose political essays stand at the head of this article, may in many respects be considered as a disciple of Haller; but a highly original disciple withal, who has developed the doctrines, and corrected some mistakes of his celebrated master. We shall now give a sketch of his life, and then analyze his political system, and review his essays.

Dr. Charles Ernest Jarcke was born of highly respectable protestant parents, at Königsberg, in Prussia, in November, 1801. He prosecuted his studies in philosophy and jurisprudence, at the University of Bonn. The lec-

* Haller's great work, "Restoration of Political Science," is in six vols. 8vo. An excellent synopsis of it has been published by Scherer, which it would be well to translate into English. About twelve years ago, Haller published a history of the Reformation of the sixteenth century in Switzerland, which is much admired. His political essays and miscellanies (in 4 vols. in French and German), are very valuable. This venerable man is at Sclothurn, in the enjoyment of a green old age.

tures of one of the most distinguished ornaments of that seat of learning, Dr. Windischmann, the Catholic professor of philosophy, as well as the *Essai sur l'Indifférence en matière de Religion*, by the abbé de la Mennais, made a deep impression on the mind of the youthful Jarcke, and assisted him in his enquiries into the truth of the Catholic religion. At length in the year 1825, he made at Cologne, his solemn abjuration of protestantism, and was received into the bosom of the Catholic Church. He then took his degrees in philosophy and jurisprudence at Berlin, and published shortly after a much admired work upon criminal law. On the breaking out of the French Revolution of 1830, he founded, together with his distinguished friend Dr. Phillips, also a convert, and some other publicists, a weekly political journal, called the "*Wochen-Blatt*," for the purpose of combating the revolutionary doctrines, which had obtained the ascendancy in France, and were exerting so fatal an influence in Germany. To this Journal the illustrious Haller sent contributions, and was gratified to find such worthy co-operators in the North of Germany. Many of Jarcke's essays in that Journal have been collected in the work, which stands at the head of our article, and will later come under our notice. The ability with which this journal was conducted, and the boldness wherewith it put forth conservative principles, attacking alike absolutism and the revolution, and showing the identity of their essential principles under a difference of forms, excited the greatest sensation in Berlin. But in that capital, the strong-hold of rationalism and pantheism, and where a despotic Bureaucracy was then in the height of its power, two such liberal conservatives, and zealous Catholics, as Dr. Phillips and Dr. Jarcke, were naturally viewed with suspicion and distrust. Their efforts were counteracted on every side. At length Dr. Phillips undertook the professorships of Modern History and Canon Law, at the university of Munich; and not long afterwards prince Metternich tendered to Dr. Jarcke an important place in the foreign office at Vienna, which he accordingly accepted. It is to the credit of that eminent statesman, that he sought out and patronized Catholic talent, and employed it in the service of the state. Those two distinguished publicists, F. von Schlegel, and Adam von Müller, had previously held under him situations similar to those now offered to Dr. Jarcke. The knowledge and

experience, which our author here acquired of the political affairs of a great empire, as well as intercourse with consummate diplomatists and statesmen, were doubtless of the greatest advantage for enlarging and maturing the political views of the publicist.

In 1838, the Catholics of Germany felt the necessity of establishing a journal in order to defend the liberty of the Church, so rudely outraged in the person of the venerable archbishop of Cologne, by the Prussian government, and to enforce Catholic principles in Church and state, so violently assailed by the protestant press. Dr. Phillips, and the younger Görres, undertook the editorship of this journal; while the elder Görres, Moehler, Döllinger, Moy, Ringseis, Freyberg, and lastly, Jarcke, engaged to give it their active support. This is the celebrated periodical,* entitled, *Historisch-politische Blätter*, which we have so often had occasion to cite. This journal, for the soundness of its religious and political principles, and for the great learning and ability with which it is conducted, as well as for the influence it has exerted, and continues to exert, is quite unrivalled in Germany. Not the least valuable of its papers are the contributions from the pen of Dr. Jarcke. Among many others, we would particularly advert to his admirable essays on the political motives and personages that had a part in bringing about the German Reformation of the sixteenth century (a subject that had been before little treated), on the war of the peasants in 1525, the revolt of the anabaptists in Westphalia, and at a later period, on the articles on Josephism, and the causes of the recent Revolution in Austria.

In the fatal year, 1848, when the Austrian empire was shaken to its foundations, Dr. Jarcke, and his friend Hurter, who have precisely the same political opinions, as well as religious convictions, became a butt of calumny and invective from the Jewish literati, who then mostly conducted the revolutionary journals of Vienna. On the emperor Ferdinand's second flight from his capital, our author found it expedient to leave Vienna. Since that period, he has taken up his abode at Munich.

Though holding office under the Austrian government, Dr. Jarcke has ever been the energetic opponent of that

* It appears twice a month.

political centralization, and of those restrictions on ecclesiastical freedom, which until the happy accession of his present majesty, had from the time of the emperor Joseph II. obtained in that empire. His writings, like those of his illustrious predecessors, F. Schlegel and Adam Müller, breathe a warm love for the Church, and an ardent zeal for her liberties, as well as a determined hostility to the false political liberalism, whether it profess despotic or anarchic principles.

We intimated on a former occasion,* while we freely criticised his general policy, the enlightened patronage, which prince Metternich had extended to those Catholic publicists, and inferred from thence, as well as from other facts, the opposition of that eminent statesman to ecclesiastical Josephism and political Bureaucracy. We added, that though he had not achieved for the Church all he could, and ought to have done, he yet had rendered good service in his day, and had relaxed those fetters on her spiritual independence, which after a bitter experience his successors have been able to strike off. These great changes are often brought about by degrees only. It was thus in our own country, the relaxation of the penal laws against Catholics in 1778, and 1792, prepared the way for their total repeal in 1829.

To return to our author. Philosophic depth is not with him as with Görres and F. Schlegel, the habitual characteristic of his genius, though when his subject requires it, he is at times very profound. But the predominant qualities of his intellect are, on one hand, extraordinary sagacity, and on the other, a rare dialectic acuteness and precision. His historical knowledge is ample, and his acquaintance with the religious, social, and political condition of the various countries of Europe quite extraordinary. The weapon of satire he wields with an able hand, and his style is remarkable for clearness, and a manly vigour. He has also a great insight into the human heart; witness his masterly portraits of Robespierre and Buonaparte (*Essays*, vol. ii). Since the death of the illustrious Görres, he is certainly the first living publicist in Germany. In the collection of *Essays* at the head of our article, there

* See Dublin Review, for July, 1849. Article, Political State of Germany.

are few on ecclesiastical subjects, as they mostly appeared in the *Wochen-Blatt*, which was published in a protestant capital, and addressed in great part to protestant readers. With few exceptions, the essays are of a purely political kind; and though entitled miscellaneous, may be classed under certain heads, so as to render the work a regular treatise on political science. They are, as may be supposed, partly of a polemic, partly of a didactic kind, partly laying down the true philosophy of legislation, and partly refuting the errors of the various absolutist and revolutionary schools. The very enumeration of subjects treated will show the importance of the present work. The actual condition of the science of public or constitutional law—the origin and rights of property—the domestic constitution—the origin of the state—the primitive forms of government, such as the patriarchal, the patrimonial, the military, and the theocratic states—later, the republican form of polity—the states-constitution of the Middle Age—the British constitution—the modern representative system—the Bureaucratic state—the different elements or component parts of the Christian monarchy, such as the prerogatives of royalty—the privileges of nobility and of the clergy considered as a body politic—the rights of municipal and provincial corporations—the causes that brought about the French revolution—and lastly, the political remedies for the regeneration of Europe;—such are the momentous matters, to which our author has devoted his enquiries.

We shall now proceed to the analysis of the work.

Let us begin with the author's considerations on property.

Kant and his followers founded fifty years ago a school of abstract legislation, which taking no account of established institutions, existing laws, and vested interests, or the religious doctrines and discipline, and social habits, customs, and manners of a people, would fain abolish all systems of polity, which corresponded not with its self-conceived ideal. This philosophical school, which in religion produced so much infidelity, led in politics to the revolution. Within the last thirty years, a pseudo-historical school in Germany has risen up to oppose it. According to the system of the latter, whatever is, is right—whatever has once an historical existence, must be respected.

It is not difficult to show that such a theory involves consequences nearly as fatal, as the system it combats. It would sanction every violation of right and justice—every monstrous iniquity, that could show an historical existence. Now every law, every political institution, repugnant to religion, or to eternal justice, or to the dictates of common sense, can claim no prescriptive right. Take, for example, the law enforcing the subdivision of landed property, which has prevailed in France for the last sixty years. This law, which is ultimately ruinous to the interests of agriculture, that cannot be carried on without capital, and which saps the existence of the aristocracy, without which in a large state order and liberty cannot subsist, is certainly one, running directly counter to the sense and practice of mankind. Yet this pseudo-historical school, of which we speak, would, at whatever cost, insist on the maintenance of an institution that has been productive of so much evil to France, because it can show a prescription of sixty years. It is with reason Dr. Jarcke says, that the partisans of this system lend a helping hand to their opponents, the political rationalists, and are wont to resist the introduction of all anti-revolutionary measures, however cautiously conceived.

Before the fall nature was in entire subjection to man, while his will was in untroubled union with God, and humanity itself formed one unbroken, undivided unity in itself. But since the fall sin has disturbed the union with God; nature yields him an unwilling, grudging obedience; for it is only by the sweat of his brow he can till the earth; and the rigid principle of individualism has succeeded to the unbroken harmony of the state of original justice. Unity, or community of outward possession, was consistent only with a state of internal or moral unity. As soon as sin had implanted in the hearts of men mutual envy, jealousy, hatred, covetousness, avarice, and pride, separate interests necessarily arose; community of goods would have become a source of endless strife and confusion; and private property, with all its rights and claims, was indispensable.

Private property is not the creature of civil law, but anterior to it; for it is the necessary substratum of domestic society. The sacredness of property, which is a principle inherent in the consciences of all men, would, if it were merely the child of human legislation, be utterly

inexplicable. To deduce this institution from a mere human compact, is to deny its inviolability, and expose it to the envy of the multitude, and the caprices of tyranny. Its universality and perpetuity, its necessary co-ordination with domestic and social order, the solemn sanction which it has received under the different dispensations of God, and the instinctive reverence it has in all ages commanded from the consciences and the laws of men, prove that private property hath its root in the Divine economy of things. Human laws *protect* indeed, but *transfer* not property; or at most, they determine, in disputed cases, to what parties, by Divine right, property belongs.

But let us hear Dr. Jarcke set forth his own views, and describe the admirable manner wherein Christianity harmonizes the principles of right and charity.

“Private property, as we said above, is in its present rigid, isolated, and exclusive separatism, a consequence of the fall and of sin. Without sin, this exclusive, jealous dominion over a part of nature would not have existed. But in the present condition of humanity, with sin inherent and transmitted in its bosom, and its relation to nature perverted, property, as well as all private right, is *necessary and unavoidable*. This being established, it is clear that any attempt to alter or put an end to this state of things by *external means* (such as the abolition of hereditary right, a new distribution of earthly possessions according to the capacity or moral worth of individuals, introduction of community of goods among all the members of a state, or a concentration of the same in the sovereign power, which would allot to each individual his usufruct), such an attempt, we say, will not and cannot attain its end. To point out triumphantly the evils of private property, and of the distinction between wealth and poverty, is no difficult task. But whoso knows that the root of the evil lies in man's corrupt *will*, in his avarice, his envy, his pride, his selfishness, in short, will not be deluded into the belief, that *mere external remedies*, such as have often been proposed, and recently by the St. Simonians, will affect the roots of the malady. Would all such measures alter the corrupt nature of man? Would man (supposing such a state of things as that proposed, could ever, and even for the shortest space of time, be realized, and independently of the enormous servitude which would be the inevitable consequence of such an attempt), *would man, we say, cease to desire to possess, and to possess for himself alone?* If these questions must be answered in the negative, then every reflecting man must admit that then, perhaps under other forms, the old evil would press with even aggravated weight upon mankind.

“Since its first promulgation, Christianity, while it hath respected the necessary and inviolate sanctity of private right, hath unceas-

ingly laboured to remove, by moral means, the doubtless undeniable 'evils of private property.' If the root of the disorder lies, as we said, in the will of man, then it is only by working on that will that the evil can be removed; the *selfishness* of private property can be set aside only by *charity*.

"Christianity has accordingly suffered to subsist in the full plenitude of its rights, that dominion of the human will over the domain of nature, which each individual had acquired; and those external rights, which divide men, it has sanctioned by its precept. An unjust invasion of the rights and property of our neighbour, is in the eye of the Christian religion a grievous sin, which until compensation for the injury inflicted be rendered according to the best of our power, cannot be forgiven. Instead, therefore, of (as the ancient and modern antagonists of private property do) depreciating or undermining its rights, or secretly or avowedly preparing the way for its utter abolition, Christianity, by its sanction and consecration, imparts to that institution the fullest, most solid, and most absolute guarantee which can be imagined. Private right, indeed, in its selfish, uncharitable, rigid exclusiveness, is not considered by the Christian religion, as the ultimate and highest, or a self-dependent object. It is not, and cannot be its own end—when God committed to man the dominion over nature; so is this only a fief, a stewardship of a good intrusted to him, which he has to use and to employ, in the sense of the Giver. From this point of view our neighbour is no longer an alien, or an adversary, as in the rigid eye of law; but a brother of the same original extraction, and who hath the destiny and calling to be one day united with us. So beside and above *the division*, there is a *community* of goods. The rich man breaks his bread for the hungry; and he who possesses, to him who is needy. No one stands absolutely alone with his earthly goods: and there is a general claim of one to the possessions of the other. But no one is *forced*. It is not the outward coercion of human laws, or a new external distribution of goods, or even a compact, which may trace other bounds to property, or a poor-rate, commanded by law, that can insure the aid, which the wealthy imparts to the indigent. But these donations must proceed purely from compassion, sympathy, love, in short, from the free will of proprietors. As on one side these feelings set aside or mitigate the rigid rights of property, so they render homage on the other hand to the strictest maxims of private right. Thus both these principles—right and charity—must never be absolutely severed from each other in the consideration of private property; and it is only by such an union that this institution will be strong enough to repel attacks, to which, more than ever, it is now exposed."—Vol. iii. p. 192-5.

Let us now hear our author speak of the origin of civil government. Before entering on this subject, he refutes

Senor Marina,* the apologist for the Spanish Cortez of 1812, who cited St. Thomas Aquinas as a witness to the doctrine of the sovereignty of the people. First, the work, "*De Regimine Principum*," cited by Marina, is not by St. Thomas Aquinas, but from the pen of one of his disciples, Archbishop Agidius Romanus. Secondly, the passage quoted, which is in the sixth chapter of the first book, in stating the cases when a tyrant may be lawfully deposed, refers (as our author clearly proves from the context) not to a primitive and general social compact, but to a special elective kingdom.

Dr. Jarcke observes that the Aristotelian philosophy, which was the groundwork of the political science of the Middle Age, was the true parent of the modern false philosophy of government. Traces of an erroneous view, as to the origin of States, are, he admits, discoverable in the writings of the schoolmen. But the essential difference, as he shows, between them and Rousseau, is, that in the former an erroneous opinion, borrowed from Heathen philosophy, was neutralized by the influence of Christianity, and the practical politics of the Middle ages; whereas the sophist of Geneva, and the modern liberals, seek, by their false political system, to annihilate, or at least paralyze, the influence of Religion.

We may, for our part, be permitted to observe, that one thing is the *exposition of sound ecclesiastical, or political doctrine*; another, a *sound philosophic explanation of it*. Thus the Divine origin of the civil power, and the unlawfulness of active resistance against legitimate authority, except in certain extreme cases, the schoolmen, in conformity with the teaching of the Church, clearly inculcated. But whether they never used expressions, that accurately examined, were inconsistent with such a doctrine, or whether their philosophic theories on this matter always harmonized with their own dogmatic teaching, is quite another question.

"No error," says our author, "has been attended with more eventful, and far-reaching consequences, than the false but wide-spread doctrine, that after being preceded by an irregular and lawless state of nature, the state sprang out of a social compact of free individuals living within it. This theory was followed by the

* See his work entitled, "Theory of the Cortez."

divergent, but ruinous results of the revolution and of absolutism, which have undermined the old Christian Germanic states of Europe, and have prepared the way for a licentious anarchy as well as for a despotism, that insulted and trampled down all legal freedom.

"Whence sprang this theory? is a question which cannot be here examined. Deeper enquiries lead to the result, that the first roots of this error go beyond the origin of the party-struggles of the present time. Even Hobbes, and the writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, are not chargeable with the *invention of the theory*, though certainly the first practical application of it must be laid at their door. On the contrary, this unhistorical, and (as we must add), in its inmost essence, false and unchristian doctrine of the origin of the state, was an effect of the resuscitation of the study of Greek and Roman antiquities in the Middle Age, and especially of the exaggerated reverence, which the whole Christian west paid to the writings of Aristotle. In the Aristotelian politics, we can trace, on a nearer investigation, the first germs of what the new and better school of publicists denominates the pseudo-philosophical statesmanship."—p. 32-3.

The origin of the state is a fact that must be examined, like all facts, not by reasonings a priori, but by historical investigation. We see at various periods of history, and even in our own times, the rise of states; and we know that these have never sprung into existence by way of a social compact. And although the origin of the first state is of course involved in the obscurity which envelopes all primitive history; yet analogy, the experience of mankind, and the clearest deductions of reason, demonstrate the absurdity, as well as danger of this hypothesis. If this were the necessary preliminary condition to the rise of the first state, how is it that on the subsequent formation of states in the course of ages, the same principle has not been found to prevail?

The question as to the origin of the state is implied in that of the origin of mankind. If mankind sprung from one couple, then society is of Divine origin; but if they were originally *autochthones*, as the later Heathen philosophers conjectured, then the theory of the social compact is intelligible, and satisfactory. But happily the historical, philological, and physiological researches of recent times have given a brilliant confirmation to the record of Revelation, as to the origin of mankind, and rendered the doctrine of the *Autochthones*, though occasionally

put forward by modern rationalists, as laughable as it is impious.

In the family we see the first germ of all society. Man and woman are formed for each other, formed to give mutual aid and solace to one another, as well as to perpetuate the human race. The nature of their physical, moral, and intellectual endowments points out the character of their relations to each other, in which authority is tempered by love, and the determination of free-will blends wonderfully with the ordinance of nature. Offspring completes this society; and the nature of the relations between parents and their children cannot for a moment be doubted, since not only under God, do the latter owe their existence to the former, but their protection in helpless infancy, their sustenance, their speech, their education, and their provision and maintenance in later life.

Thus is the family the first state, and, indeed, a monarchical state.

Holy Writ furnishes little information respecting the infancy of human society; but as it expressly records the longevity of the first patriarchs, we may conclude (and, indeed, we know the fact from tradition) that they exerted a royal authority over their tribes. After the great catastrophe of the deluge inflicted on a guilty world, mankind was renovated by the family of Noah so miraculously preserved. The human race again formed one family, till, on an extraordinary event mentioned in Scripture, they dispersed, and were divided into a multitude of tribes, races and nations, independent of, and even hostile to, each other, and possessing each its own political laws and institutions.

The tribe which at first consisted merely of the children, kinsmen, and immediate descendants of the patriarch, is gradually augmented by the acquisition of captives in war, the purchase of slaves, and the voluntary submission of others who seek the protection of the chieftain, or desire to cultivate his lands, or tend his flocks. This is the first territorial monarchy, or, as it is rightly termed by Haller, the patrimonial state.

When, in course of time, the territory becomes too contracted for the increased numbers of the tribe, or they are hard pressed by formidable foes, then a portion of young adventurers, under a leader of their choice, migrate in search of new lands. These territories they subjugate, reducing

their inhabitants by force of arms, or entering into treaty with them, by allowing them, under certain conditions, the retention of the whole, or part of their lands. This is the military state, or the monarchy founded by conquest.

Although these two forms of government, the patrimonial and the military state, spring not so immediately or directly from nature, as the patriarchal constitution, or domestic government, yet are they necessary developments of the latter. No social compact creates or precedes the patrimonial state; for the captives who are made in war, and the slaves who are bought, make no treaty whatever; and the engagements which individuals, families, or even tribes, enter into for their own protection sake, or for the purchase of lands, and the performance of domestic services, do not create the patrimonial state, but only augment and enlarge its boundaries and numbers. These secondary, subordinate, and specific contracts, which expediency, or even necessity dictate, must not be confounded with that primitive, universal, social compact, which a rationalist philosophy dreams of; and this for several reasons. 1. These contracts are not made between isolated independent individuals, possessed of equal rights and power, but between the strong and the weak, the one seeking protection, the other service, or augmentation of power. 2. These engagements are made with a pre-existing authority, and pre-suppose an already organized community, and, consequently, are posterior to the formation of human society. 3. These contracts regard specific individual interests, (though, doubtless, they form an important element in the growth of states,) but involve not the permanent general interests of mankind.

The same remark holds good in respect to the military state. Unity of power is necessary for the successful conduct of war; and the band of adventurers who go out in quest of conquest, are commanded, either by their natural hereditary chieftain, or by one whom, on account of birth, character, valour, or martial skill, they have elected for their leader. But the natural endowments which imperiously dictate such a choice are a gift of God; and men in the election of such a chief, follow, as it were, the voice of Heaven.

Then there is the theocratic state, where the chiefs hold their authority, not by a popular delegation, but by a commission, true or false, derived, or pretended to be

derived, from Heaven. These three forms of government, the patrimonial, the military, the theocratic, are derivations or offshoots from the domestic or patriarchal constitution.

"To these original simple forms of rule," says our author, "must be referred every independent government, that is to say, every relation of authority and obedience among men, which is not subject to a higher sway. But here we must not overlook the fact, that in history and in actual life these forms of government are not so strongly and rigidly separated, as for the sake of scientific purposes, we must classify them in theory. Thus, as the independent tribe, though it be even nomade, if it desires to maintain a permanent independence, must call some territory its own, the tribe, or patriarchal constitution, becomes thereby transformed into the territorial or patrimonial dominion. The patrimonial state is, in course of time, inevitably necessitated to take in defence of its territory and independence, measures of resistance against foreign foes, and consequently to assume, more or less, the form of the military monarchy. On the other hand, the warlike band and its leader, when they wish not always to live on booty, but to obtain a lasting footing and establishment in the conquered land, must settle down, more or less, into a patrimonial state. Lastly, every government has a certain admixture of theocratic elements; whether the territorial lord or military chief unite in his person the dignity of a Pontiff, or whether, as protector of an independent Church, he receive from the latter a religious consecration, as the German emperors received, not by their coronation merely, but by the doctrine of the office and calling of christian sovereignty. Even the purely theocratic constitution, when it acquires an independent territory, must assume some of the characteristics, not only of the patrimonial, but of the military monarchy." —p. 52-3. vol. iii.

But there is another form of government which we have not spoken of, and which seems at first sight to be repugnant to our author's theory, as to the origin of the state. This is the republic. It may be objected, indeed, that as this government represents a division of powers, and as it is the creature of a contract between independent individuals, it is neither the product of nature, nor the representative of those relations of superiority and dependency, which enter into the very constitution of the Governments we have described.

In the establishment of the Republic, as the author well observes, the will of man is, indeed, more prominently active, than in the rise of the tribe-constitution, which is

the immediate development of the family. But, as he shows, the Republic is not the creature of human fancy or caprice, but the result of circumstances independent of man's volition. The fiction of a primitive social compact does not cease to be a fiction, because of the existence of Republics; for in those early forms of monarchical government, which grew immediately out of the family, specific and secondary compacts, as we have seen, served to enlarge and augment their power. It is so with the Republic. Firstly, in this government, as in all others, there are the same relations of authority and obedience, superiority and dependence; and the only difference is, that power is vested in the hands of many instead of one. Even in the most unbridled democracy, there is a ruling class; and the majority of its inhabitants, consisting of women, children, minors, the destitute, servants and slaves are excluded, not only from a direct, but even indirect, participation in power. In every Republic, whereof history records the establishment, it has been the *heads of families*, and not the latter description of persons, that have taken part in the foundation. The assertion of Locke, that "no one possesses a power over another, which the latter has not transferred," is utterly belied by history. In even the wildest democracy, the great bulk of the inhabitants are ruled, not only without their co-operation, but even against their sanction and consent.

Secondly, reason as well as experience, proves that the Republic was not the primitive government; but that wherever it occurs, it grew out of those earlier constitutions of civil society above described. And the reason for this is very justly assigned by Haller in the following passage.

"The foundation of republics," he says, "is extremely arduous, and still more arduous is the acquisition and perpetuation of their independence; and here must the reason be sought for, wherefore their occurrence in history is so rare, and of so late a date. Men of themselves are not so inclined, as is generally thought, towards relations of community, towards common possessions. One is never free, never master of one's own, and no one would fain tolerate a partner in his power. 'Omnisque potestas impatiens consortis erit.' Community is rather the mother of all strife; for, in cases of collision, the pretensions of two men equally entitled to one and the same object, cannot be reconciled. No man in the world willingly submits to his equal, when he can help it, or even

likes to receive orders from him ; and the too frequent compliances which, even in things over which he has a share of controul, are exacted of him, become at last onerous to the most pacific. Hence, even common lands and possessions, which may serve as the basis of a community, are rather distasteful to men, and mostly give occasion only to disputes and hostilities."*

Let us hear our author describe the manner in which Republics usually arise.

"The circumstances and conditions under which an independent community comes into existence, cannot, as is evident, be previously determined as to all particulars by any theoretic deduction. Here doctrine must be inferred from the enlarged experience of our kind—history to wit ;—but the enumeration of all particular cases can never be reduced to a rigid, logical, systematic form. The simplest case of collective power most proximate to monarchy, is that where several sons or heirs of a potentate share among them the heritage of his dominions, and administer them in common. By such co-dominion, doubtless, a commonwealth is founded ; but its duration, as history shews, is never of a very lasting kind. More frequently doth the independent 'commonwealth spring out of the ruins of monarchical power, when a common necessity prevents their utter destruction, and moulds them into a Republic. In these cases a new regal dominion is prevented coming into life, *only because* the elements composing society are equal in strength ; or because when such is not the case, all have an interest that each should remain independent. Thus to take a near example ; after the downfall of the old Imperial Dignity, and the sad interregnum of a foreign domination, which had brought home to all the necessity of mutual co-operation, the commonwealth of the Germanic Diet sprang out of the ruins of the Holy Roman empire of Germany. This Diet owed its origin to the sense of the necessity of a common defence against foreign foes, and did not assume the imperial form, because, on one hand, no one would sacrifice his independence, and on the other hand, no one would burthen himself with an impotent sceptre.†

* See Haller's Restor. of Polit. Science, vol. i.

† This is a proof of the above enunciated proposition, that it is not the volition and deliberation of men, but the pressure of circumstances, that is to say, *nature* which founds Republics as well as monarchical states. *The will* to restore the Germanic Empire was, doubtless, to be found in many ; but as the common people are wont to say in like cases, "it was as if it were not to be," and the nature of things imperiously required the *Diet*, that is to say, the federative Republic.

"In other cases a community has grown up in a state of dependence on some prince, or has been founded by him ; but from increase of power, and by turning to account favourable outward circumstances, it acquires a *de facto*, or even legal independence of its former sovereign. Thus did the North American Republics, the Lombard cities in the Middle Age, and the still existing cities of the Germanic Diet, rise to the rank of independent states.

"Lastly, history shows, moreover, a third series of cases, where external circumstances, such as common necessity and danger, or common wants, and common possessions, united together a certain number of families or individuals, independent of each other, and equal, or nearly so, in power, such families or individuals then, urged by the very necessities of contact and close community, were forced to conclude a mutual league, and enter accordingly into social relations. Those who in such cases found a commonwealth, are mostly fugitives, or emigrants and colonists from other countries, who quit another state of society, meet in a third place, and here, on account of their equality in power, establish a Republic. Had any individual or family possessed preponderant power, the nature of things would have led to the establishment of a principality, as, in the course of time, such always arises, when authority is concentrated in the heads of some members of the Republic. An example of this kind is presented, not only by the Colonies of Antiquity, and the League of the seven chieftains in Ireland—who, weary of perpetual feuds, founded among themselves a judicature, called Althing—but by the Republic of Venice. There, Italian nobles, flying before the ravages of the half-savage hordes who were inundating Italy, took refuge in the islands of the Lagunes, and established a commonwealth, based on strict equality in the ruling class of nobles.

"In the foregoing dissertation, we have described the manner in which nature calls into life independent principalities and Republics. By this view of the subject, not only is the doctrine of the origin of government established on the domain of real life, and a reconciliation brought about between theory and reality, but by the overthrow of the fiction of the *Social Compact*, a multitude of erroneous deductions, equally fatal to rulers and to subjects, is swept away."—Vol. iii. p. 61-4.

From an enquiry into the rise of civil government, we are naturally led to investigate the question as to the legitimacy or illegitimacy of power ; and this subject the author treats with great ability. We shall give a brief analysis of his remarks.

Political power is as much the subject of legitimate ownership as any other possession, and the confusion of ideas that prevails in our times on this matter, is one of

the most fearful symptoms of the moral and political depravity of the age. If the possession of the throne be not held inviolate, what other right, public or private, will be esteemed sacred among men? Legality is often opposed to legitimacy by the partisans of revolutionary disorder; but if human laws have not a foundation in divine right and eternal justice, what respect will they obtain, and what stability will they ever acquire?

Royal legitimacy is the best protectress of freedom; for the usurper, who obtains a throne by craft or violence, must employ the same means to perpetuate his sway. As he is almost sure to encounter resistance from the partisans of the dethroned dynasty, he must, in self-defence, have recourse to measures of repression and severity against them; and these measures will, of course, affect the rest of the community. If the usurper, as our author well observes, be a man of energetic character, then he must be a tyrant; and if, on the other hand, he be a man of only ordinary capacity and feeble purpose, then he is sure to be overturned, and only prepares the way for new commotions and revolutions. A legitimate king may have a tyrannic temper, but as his interests are bound up with the institutions of his country, and as all respect his hereditary rights, he has infinitely fewer motives or temptations to commit abuses of power than an usurper.

But legitimacy of power is a principle not absolute, but relative. Not to mention the fact, which is beside the question, that a legitimate king may, by certain acts and in certain cases become illegitimate, an usurper may, in respect to certain persons and things, be the rightful monarch. This matter our author illustrates with an admirable clearness of reasoning. He cites the example of the late Elector of Hesse, and of the usurper, Jerome Buonaparte, whom his brother, forty years ago, intruded into that principality. Jerome, though evidently an usurper, was still the legitimate prince in respect to those Frenchmen who had accompanied him from Paris, and had never owned the Elector of Hesse for their sovereign. He was such also, at least for the time being, in regard to all those Hessians who had taken an oath of allegiance to him, and received from him honours and pensions; * and the same

* If they wish to rise against the usurper, they must first give up their honours and pensions.

remark holds good in regard to those foreign powers who in the treaty of Tilsit had acknowledged his authority. As the Protector (for the time being) of social order, he was the rightful sovereign, in respect to all criminals and malefactors, as likewise against any usurper or revolutionist, who, by virtue of any other title than that of Elector of Hesse, sought to subvert his throne.

But in regard to the great mass of the inhabitants of Hesse, who had viewed the usurpation with repugnance, and had given only a passive acquiescence to what they could not avoid, as well as those who with the rightful sovereign had fled the country, Jerome Buonaparte was in every sense an illegitimate prince. These would be perfectly justified in rising against the usurper, and driving him from his throne. Yet any such attempt that had no possibility or even probability of success, any attempt that without accomplishing the end proposed would serve only to throw the country into misery and confusion, would be highly punishable and sinful.

The authority of this usurper might have become legitimate in various ways; either by a renunciation of his rights on the part of the lawful sovereign, or by the extinction of the ancient dynasty, or by such a lengthened prescription of years, that the expulsion of the usurper or of his family is either wholly impracticable, or would at least entail immense evils on the State.*

Hence, as the author concludes, the one proposition that Jerome Buonaparte was as legitimate a sovereign as any other in Europe, and the other proposition, that Jerome Buonaparte had no more claims on his subjects than any highway robber; these two propositions, so unqualified, are both equally false.

With the doctrine of popular sovereignty, no doubt, the notion of legitimacy is utterly incompatible. Hence the war which all revolutionists wage against the latter principle.

In connection with the subjects we have just analysed, it may be in place to advert (for want of space will not allow us to do more) to some of our author's observations on the inequality of social conditions.

* What length of prescription be needful to constitute legitimacy, is a matter which cannot be beforehand theoretically determined, for it depends on a thousand circumstances, that elude analysis.

Man, as we have seen, is a being essentially social; and where there is society, there must there be subordination. The inequality of ranks is, moreover, only the expression of that inequality which prevails in the physical constitution, the intellectual capacity, the character, the temper, the industry, the education, the opportunities, and lastly, the virtues of different men. And supposing it even possible that by any external violence this inequality of ranks could even for a short space of time be set aside, it would, from the very nature of men, in the course of a generation or two, revive, perforce, under nearly the same forms as at present. The harsh forms, indeed, which that inequality now assumes, are one of the melancholy results of the fall of man.

We regret that we cannot cite some of the author's interesting observations on nobility. This institution, which upholds the dignity of the Crown and protects the liberties of the people, is the key-stone to the political edifice. And it is no exaggeration to say, that the Catholic who thinks soundly on nobility, (provided he be sincerely zealous for the liberties of his Church,) will be sure to think soundly on almost every other constitutional topic. But if a man be hostile to an hereditary nobility, (especially if he be a Protestant, or a Catholic indifferent about the spiritual independence of his Church,) then is he sure to be the conscious or unconscious partisan of a military despotism, or a licentious democracy.

The author has several able dissertations on the old States-Constitution, which, copied unconsciously from the constitution of the Catholic Church, insured, even in its undeveloped form in the Middle Age, the harmonious co-operation of authority and freedom. Between this form of government and the modern representative systems that have, since the French revolution of 1789, sprung up out of a defective or superficial imitation of the British Constitution, he institutes some interesting comparisons.

In the States-constitution, the prince, who, as we have seen, was in the origin of society the first landed proprietor, enjoys his own independent patrimony. In the modern representative system, he is a mere pensioner on the bounty of Parliament. In the States-constitution, the monarch within the sphere of his prerogatives, is a perfectly free, independent agent. In the other system of government, he can act only by the advice and instru-

mentality of his responsible counsellors; so that, hereby, in fact, the sovereign power is virtually lodged in the hands of the ministers. In the States-constitution, the lords spiritual and temporal sit in Parliament by virtue of their hereditary rights and ecclesiastical sees; but in many of the modern constitutional governments, as they are called, these peers, whether lay or ecclesiastical, are nominated by the favour of the Crown.

Then with regard to the representation of the Commons, "the States," in the words of our author, "grant their subsidies out of their own means, and are, at any rate, the natural representatives of specific corporations and interests. The popular representatives, on the other hand, in the modern system, are nothing more than a quota out of a mass of individuals, with whom they stand in no natural connection, and are not representatives of common interests but of mere individual opinions, as to the well-being of the State, and its wants and necessities. They are a fraction, which by mere accident of election has issued, as by lottery, out of an arbitrarily designated body of electors, who, according to an equally arbitrary rate of taxation, constitute a privileged minority, having no necessary connection, and in no wise representing the interests of the bulk of the population."

Again, the old States-constitution was based on the principle of self-government in the administration, on the freest municipal system, on provincial parliaments, city corporations, and on local laws, customs, privileges, and franchises. The representative system, on the other hand, in most modern constitutional countries, as they are called, is founded on the revolutionary system of Bureaucratic centralization, which is incompatible with all free, municipal government, and is destructive to all local liberties.

Between the old States-constitution and the modern representative system, the British Constitution holds a sort of a middle place. Apart from the great religious change of the sixteenth century, which by bringing the clergy into a state of servile dependence on the Crown, exerted no unimportant influence on its social position, and apart from the important modifications which the revolution of 1688 introduced, in the exercise of the royal prerogative, the British is in many respects a surviving remnant of the old States-constitution. Our Constitution is indeed a

splendid Gothic pile, where the old, deep, broad foundations remain unimpaired, and the strong buttresses and the elegant turrets and pinnacles of the mediæval time have been preserved, while there have been some strange alterations in the chancel, and a tower of quite a modern construction has been erected. In our author's eulogies on the excellent municipal government, the free local institutions, the wise laws of England, and on the vigorously organised aristocracy, which has struck such deep roots in the national soil, all constitutional Englishmen will be disposed to concur. But in regard to his strictures on the state of impotence to which the royalty of 1688 has been reduced, there will not be the same unanimity of opinion. This subject, which on a former occasion we have adverted to, we cannot here stop to discuss. But we may observe, that Cobbett long ago pointed out the evils resulting from the sale of the Crown lands, whereby not only was the revenue charged with heavy obligations, but royalty was bereaved of its ancient patrimony, and rendered dependent for its very subsistence on the good-will of Parliament. The excessive restrictions, too, set at the revolution, on the exercise of the royal veto, have been lamented by recent English writers, who consider the strengthening of the royal prerogative as the only barrier against the advances of democracy.

The following is an admirable sketch of the Bureaucratic State, whereof Dr. Jarcke witnessed so striking a specimen in Berlin.

"The opposite doctrine," says he, "that the 'State' should bring about a certain condition of universal felicity, and should prosecute this 'state-object' at the cost of justice, necessarily led to the most various evils. The immediate effect of this doctrine was, as we before observed, the necessity imposed on Governments of taking into their hands the actual conduct, administration, and economy, of all things; for only under this condition could they fulfil the task they had proposed, of conferring universal happiness, and only upon this condition could they be responsible for this engagement. From this necessity followed, as matter of course, the intrusion of the civil power into every sphere of life, *the much-government and over-government*, and again, the stifling of all free, independent life, in every department, and especially the annihilation of all self-government, or self-administration of different interests. All must emanate from and revert to the huge, all-devouring body of the

state, which a master* in the theory of this liberal absolutism fittingly termed '*Leviathan*.' Hence was the Church deprived of all free, independent action, of all self-government and administration of her affairs; but her freedom was annihilated, either directly by the usurpation of ecclesiastical power on the part of the state, or in an indirect and covert way, by the pretended right of supervision, or protection, or prevention of so-called abuses. Hence no more freedom for civil corporations, but a rigid tutelage exerted by the state over all their internal concerns; the destruction to their autonomy; and the control over the management of their property, coupled with a thousand restrictions and limitations in its enjoyment and possession. Hence also the attempt from the same quarter to regulate by laws, and control by functionaries private individuals in the management of their family concerns, to direct their household by the laws of political economy, to interfere with the education of their children, and restrict in every way their power over their servants and workmen.

"How much in this course of policy so pursued by the state, the sanctity of right, and personal liberty in a certain sense identical with it, must suffer, is evident of itself. But even by the total annihilation of individual freedom, the object sought for—the happiness of all, would not be attained. On the whole, it is beyond the power of human government, *to make men happy*; at most it can by the rights which it exercises, and the protection which it imparts, insure to the personal liberty of the individual a scope, within which the latter may provide for his material well-being. But happiness, so far as it can exist on earth, can come only from above, and is a blessing of God. But by government measures to make *all* happy, is one of the most absurd ideas that can be conceived; for the relations of men in society are so peculiarly constituted, that a measure which according to all appearance, promotes the earthly prosperity of one individual, obstructs, undermines, and destroys that of another. Lastly, those bound together by a common interest, understand what can best forward it, far better than all the functionaries of state, who would take it under their tutelary care. The former mostly desire only permission to have free, unfettered scope for their exertions and energies.†

"Besides the destruction to personal liberty, and the utter impossibility of attaining the end proposed, this system of Bureaucratic centralization leads to the weakening and degradation of regal power. By mixing up the authority of government in all concerns, this system appears indeed to give indefinite extension to the royal prerogative; but it is precisely this very indefinite extension of the

* Hobbes.

† The merchants replied to the minister Colbert, on his demand, What he could do for them? "*Laissez-nous faire, Monseigneur*?"

power of the 'state,' which seriously endangers the good, old, substantial, legitimate rights of sovereignty. If government meddles with everything, so every one will in turn meddle with what was formerly the proper concerns of government, and what was exclusively *its* interest, for which it had to render account to no man. But if all are to be made happy at the cost of all, then the sovereign must not be excluded from the general lottery; he must throw in his rights, his prerogatives, and his liberty into the hotch-potch of the public weal, thence to draw out again his share in the common prosperity."—p. 383-6. vol. iii.

To this state of things the author opposes the admirable system of administration which prevails in England. After stating the objection, made by the advocates of centralization, that the free system of administration might be well suited to the Middle Age, which possessed not the high political intelligence of our times; and that necessity has introduced the modern Bureaucracy, which is adapted to modern manners and modern wants, he replies as follows:

"To this assertion we may oppose the example of England. Far from England's being behind the age, it is precisely the European country, which in respect to industry has reached the highest pitch of refinement; and in all which appertains to the well-being of the individual, and to the ease and conveniences of life, has attained to the highest degree of development. But in that country, almost everything is administered by the parties interested themselves, and as a modern writer* has said with incomparable truth, the dread of governing on the part of the government, and the spirit of association in individuals, lend each other the hand, and realize the most extensive enterprizes.

"In fact England's political constitution and administration not merely in themselves, but in the influence which they have exerted on the other countries of Europe, are in the highest degree remarkable. England is indeed the country, which it is so frequently boasted to be by the friends and foes alike of revolution—the land, where freedom (in the true and Germanic sense of the word) hath by a wonderful coincidence of fortunate circumstances, though together with many abuses, and even undeniable excesses, been preserved. But at the same time England's constitution hath

* See the work entitled, "Description of the internal administration of Great Britain" (in German). By Baron von Vincke, Royal Prussian president, Berlin, 1815. The work is cited with much praise by Dr. Jarcke.

exerted the most unhappy influence on the rest of Europe, as it led to the general, calamitous misunderstanding,* that liberty consists in 'the three powers.' Thus arose, as it was easy to fashion, two chambers after a general model, the abortions of the representative system, which are now the scourge of Europe.

"The true English liberty remained hidden from the eyes of the world. People constantly lulled themselves with the hope that freedom would spring up in a land, when they only there transplanted a copy, and (often so miserable a copy) of parliament, without considering what foundations the two houses in England rest on, and that these form merely the summits of a mighty edifice, concealed from the eye of the superficial observer. The English parliament doth not constitute freedom itself; but the freedom, existing independently of it, is there manifested. The genuine English liberty, and the feeling of contentment which, in direct opposition to the mock freedom of the representative system, it diffuses over the public mind, has its root in other principles.† It consists partly in the religious reverence for all private rights, by virtue whereof each one knows that his life, his property, and his whole condition cannot become the sport of legislative caprice neither on the part of an individual, nor of a deliberative assembly, and partly, and chiefly, in the *internal administration*, which with admirable wisdom secures full liberty to every development of life in every sphere, and forms the direct antithesis to the despotic Bureaucracy of Napoleon.

"The interior government of Great Britain rests on the great principle of letting the administration, which in other countries falls to the care of the rulers, be exercised as much as possible by the administrated themselves. This self-government takes place in such a way, that either fitting and trustworthy persons are invested by the people with certain official functions, or so far as it is practicable, the care of providing for certain public wants, whose satisfaction with us falls within the province of the state, is abandoned to private enterprise."—p. 390-5, vol. iii.

The author has many admirable reflections on the

* Particularly with Montesquien and Delolme. The former, while we render full justice to his personal intentions, must still be regarded as the father of modern constitutionalism—a system which undermines all monarchical authority, as well as all true freedom.

† Let every honest, unprejudiced man answer the question, whether the representative system in all the countries where it has been established, doth not engender the sense of insecurity for all existence, universal distrust, and a feverish excitement, and destroy all serene, innocent joys on the part of the people.

French Revolution, from its first rise in 1789 down to that of the three days of July. And though these essays were written fifteen, and some of them twenty years ago, he has predicted with wonderful skill the course which that great social movement has since taken. Among other things, he foretold, in the year 1831, that the next institution which the Revolution would assail in France, would be property, and more especially, monied property. How well did 1848 respond to this prediction! He pointed out, in 1832, the dangers that would ensue to the Catholic party in France from any alliance with the Revolution, and refuted with consummate ability, the political errors of the journal, "*L'Avenir*," and the more monstrous aberrations into which its once illustrious editor subsequently fell.

We must now conclude with the following interesting account of the States-General in ancient France. The author takes occasion to refute the vulgar error, that the old French Government was a purely arbitrary one. He shows, that even after the extinction of the States-General, freedom, however imperfectly, was defended by provincial states, local customs and franchises; and lastly, by the parliaments.

"Originally," says our author, "the same constitution existed in France, as in the rest of Europe. The French Kings lived in former times, as all other sovereigns in Europe, upon their regalia and demesnes, waged war by the aid of their vassal subjects, and in cases of distress, solicited the good-will of their free subjects for a grant of money. Since the time of Philippe-Bel (1301), the deliberations of the representatives of the three free estates in behalf of those pecuniary subsidies had become habitual. In all relating to the maintenance of his prerogatives, to the preservation of peace at home and abroad, to public order and the administration of justice, the king, indeed, was and remained supreme lord and master, and in the possession of undivided sovereignty. But the states had the right of opposing any ordinance which might trench on their property or their liberties. They demanded justice for any abuses and transgressions in this respect, and desired accounts, nay often self-administration of the monies they granted, as a security for their application to the useful purposes intended. Moreover, there were special states-corporations in the provinces, and more particularly was this the case in the provinces that had been conditionally incorporated with the French monarchy, where these states retained a large share of their rights. These provinces, called *Pays d'Etats*, were Provence,

Burgundy, Languedoc, Bretagne, Navarre, Béarn, and some small districts in the south of France, and on the Spanish frontier.* In these provinces the provincial states assembled at certain fixed periods, and without the royal convocation, and after the model of the *Etats Généraux*. The subsidies which they granted to the crown, they levied on all subject to imposts according to a settled quota, and gathered them in by means of their own functionaries, charged them with debts, and instituted measures for their liquidation. 'Even the police and other branches of the civil Administration were within the jurisdiction of the states, and usually the king on the acquisition of these provinces explicitly bound himself to act in all affairs as their lord paramount, with the concurrence only of the states, and especially to change nothing in the existing laws, and in the forms of judicature and civil administration, without their express consent.†

"It is well known that in France, since the commencement of the seventeenth century, the same phenomenon occurred, which with the exception of England, took place in every other European country. Monarchical authority had obtained the preponderance; the power of the states was cramped, or thrown into the back ground; and the *Etats-Généraux*, after having been assembled for the last time at Blois, in the year 1614, were never again convoked. Even the provincial states were paralysed in their action; many of them were entirely suppressed; and others by a prudent spirit of accommodation, saved their existence and their rights. From this period the crown levied imposts in all those districts, which had lost their provincial states, without the consent of those subject to taxation. Yet an accurate enquiry instituted by the author of the above-cited work,‡ shows that the *Pays d' Etats*, relatively to their power, contributed, though under other denominations, at least as much to the public burthens, as those provinces that were taxed by the court. Hence we may deduce the inference that the result of this arbitrary taxation was on the whole the same, as if these provinces had raised and apportioned their own taxes.

"That this extinction, or repression of the states-constitution was a misfortune;—that this work of destruction was a blunder and an error, we certainly would be the last to call in question. The consequences of such a suppression were manifest, when the court took steps to convoke the states-general. The hundred and seventy-five years' desuetude, into which this institution had fallen, had produced on the part of government an utter ignorance of par-

* *Franche Comté* was also included among these.

† See the German work entitled "*History of the Political Revolution in France under King Lewis XVI.*"

‡ *History of French Revolution*, vol. i. p. 91-2.

liamentary forms and deliberations, which was now to receive a fearful and bitter chastisement. It is equally beyond a question, that that vertigo which seized on the whole nation, and drove it into the abyss, when after so long an interval the question as to the convocation of the *Etats Generaux* was agitated, was the effect of the suspension of the constitutional functions of the 'states.' But this was not a mere French, but an European calamity—an abuse, but no material distress, least of all one, which would have occasioned the subversion of the state. Moreover, it is to be observed, that it was not the adherence of the government to that abuse, but precisely the abandonment of it, which brought about the outbreak of the Revolution. But the question immediately before us is, whether the power of the French kings at the period when Lewis the Sixteenth mounted the throne, was theoretically and practically a despotism, whose intolerable weight necessarily produced the overthrow of the constitution. In direct variance with such a view, history shows us, that in despite of this non-convocation of the *Etats-Generaux*, the old idea that the king in the exercise of his authority, was bound to the inviolate maintenance of the rights of his subjects, subsisted in France, though under a new and fantastic form, yet with much more vigour and vivacity, than in many other countries."—p. 423-5.

We regret that want of space prevents us from rendering full justice to these remarkable volumes, which, besides the purely didactic articles, contain some essays of an historical kind, such as the history of Illuminism and Carbonarism, and a biographical sketch of the late emperor, Francis II., which are well deserving of attention.

Whoever wishes to know the true spirit and character of political liberalism, should study it in the writings of a master, who has had ample opportunities for the execution of his task. Surely this study on the part of British Catholics, is no work of supererogation. The recent persecution, or attempt at persecution of our Church, has sprung not from the vulgar protestant bigotry, not from the anti-Christian radicalism (though these have been agents and allies in the work), but from that despotic liberalism, which will tolerate no authority external to itself—or what it calls an *imperium in imperio*. If it could once succeed in suspending what it calls "the Synodical action of our Church" in these realms—in prohibiting our ecclesiastical councils, and suppressing our religious orders, it would soon lay its irreverent hands on our municipal corporations, and establish its cherished system of administrative centralization. This is a warning which all enlightened protestants should take to heart.

ART. IV.—*Christianity in Ceylon. Its Introduction and Progress under the Portuguese, the Dutch, the British, and American Missions.*
By Sir JAMES EMERSON TENNENT, K.C.S., LL.D., &c. John Murray, London.

"FOR some years past," says Sir Emerson Tennent, in his Introduction, "I have been engaged in the preparation of a work on Ceylon; its history, its topography, its capabilities, its productions, its government, its present condition, and its future prospects, as a colony of the Crown." This, he goes on to say, will account for a good deal that may seem abrupt or obscure in the present chapters, as they were intended as part of a larger work. To our minds it will account for a good deal more. We must say, that it was with the greatest surprise that we heard Sir Emerson had written a book on Christianity in Ceylon. We knew him indeed to be a scholar, a man of genius and thought, and one who, finding himself in so interesting a colony, would be sure to make himself master of a great deal of information respecting it. Had he written on any one of the subjects he enumerates,—the history of the island, its topography, its capabilities, its productions, its present or possible condition as a colony of the Crown,—nothing would have seemed to us more natural. But we never did expect him to choose the present condition and future prospects of the Christian Church there. It never struck us that a missionary spirit was his hobby. But now we see how it is. Sir Emerson was going to publish a large work, and tell us all about Ceylon and the Singhalese. All people except the costermongers, as Mr. Mayhew tells us, have some religion. Religion being one of the little accidentals of our existence here below, the work would have been incomplete without some notice of it. Besides, even statesmen have discovered, like Gibbon's philosophers, that religions, if not true, are at least useful; they civilize mankind, and keep them in order. Religion is a sort of spiritual police,

"Emollit mores nec sinit esse feros."

It must not, therefore, be overlooked by the politician. It

is then, with reason, that Sir Emerson says, that in such a work as he proposed, "Christianity necessarily occupied a prominent place." And thus the present chapters swelled in bulk until they were of sufficient size to form a separate work, under the title of "Christianity in Ceylon."

We do not wish to be uncharitable towards Sir Emerson, but we really do desiderate in his book something indicative of a real interest in the progress of Christianity, as the means not merely of making men good citizens and respectable members of society, but of saving their souls. He tells us in his Preface, that he hopes that his work "will be read with interest by all who look on missionary labour not merely in its loftier capacity, as the disseminator of immortal truth, but who regard it in its incidental influence as the great pioneer of civilization, and the most powerful agent for the diffusion of intellectual and moral enlightenment." There are indeed a decent number of passages which allude to the fact that Christianity has another object besides that of civilizing and improving the state of a country. Desirable, indeed, as it may be, that the gardens of the Singhalese should be enlarged, their dwellings embellished, cultivation extended, and new roads opened, as we are told is the case, (p. 324,) in the neighbourhood of every missionary station, yet the eye of the Christian missionary rests with far greater pleasure on the humble souls, who in the midst, it may be, of their ignorance and uncivilization, are yet in the way, as he hopes, of being saved. In *his* mind, education and civilization are important, as a means made use of to make men Christians. The statesman seems ever haunted with the idea that Christianity is the means to them.

Yet, notwithstanding all this, the book may be read with interest. There is a good deal of information in it. And one test of its general accuracy is, that the mis-statements of one place are corrected by another. However strangely perverted the view which the author takes of certain facts, yet he has had the good sense to give the facts and the perversion separately; so that we can take the one without accepting the other. Indeed, with respect to the latter, as we shall hereafter have occasion to point out, we could not have a more complete refutation than is afforded in the work itself.

It is divided into six chapters. The first gives an

account of the introduction of Christianity into Ceylon, and its progress under the Portuguese, *i. e.*, from A. D., 1505 to 1638. The second is the Dutch period, from 1638 till Ceylon became a British possession, in 1802. The third chapter gives an account of what has been done by different missionary societies under the British Government. In the fourth and fifth chapters, we have a short account of Brahminism and Buddhism respectively. And the sixth chapter is entitled, "Moral and Social character of the Singhalese," but it is chiefly taken up with the present state of the Protestant missions there, and their prospects for the future. Our present object is, to give an account from the work itself of the progress of Catholicism in Ceylon, and to show the comparative results which have followed from the attempts of Protestant missionaries to establish their religion.

There is but little certain information respecting the first introduction of Christianity into the island in the Apostolic and the Middle Ages. But Sir Emerson remarks, that before the arrival of the Portuguese, Christianity had from one cause or another almost disappeared from Ceylon, and they found the doctrines of Brahma and Buddha the prevailing religions respectively of the Tamils in the north, and of the Singhalese throughout the rest of the island. The progress of Christianity under the Portuguese is certainly most remarkable. Sir Emerson himself tells us, that the Catholic clergy "succeeded in an incredibly short space of time in effecting multitudinous conversions" among the Singhalese of the south. With regard to the north, he says:

"In point of time, the conversion of the Singhalese Buddhists to Christianity, preceded by several years the earliest attempt to reclaim the Tamils in Ceylon from the superstition of Brahma. The Portuguese got possession of Colombo in 1505, but it was not till 1548 that they obtained such a footing in the northern province as to enable their missionaries to commence their labours with security amongst the natives of Jaffna. Immediately after constructing the fort of Colombo, the adjoining districts were erected into a Bishopric, and under the directions of the new prelate, Christianity was speedily proclaimed throughout the Singhalese districts; but it was not till A. D. 1544 that it was first preached to the Tamils of the north by the 'Apostle of India,' S. Francis Xavier. He was invited from Madura by the Parawas, or Fisher caste, who had established themselves around the pearl fishery of

Manaar, of whom he baptized from *six to seven hundred*. But almost immediately after, they were cut to pieces by the Rajah of Jaffna, who was incensed at their apostacy. His efforts to extirpate Christianity from his dominions, were, however, utterly futile; the influence of the Portuguese and their priests was too powerful to be long resisted; his own sons and relations became converts, and flying from Ceylon, they placed themselves under the protection of the Viceroy of Goa."—pp. 9, 11.

The effect of this was, that the power of the Portuguese was so much increased, that at last the Rajah was in fear for himself, and made overtures to Xavier, professing his readiness to become a Christian. First an alliance was made, and at last he was expelled from the island, and his kingdom was incorporated with the Portuguese dominions.

"The whole extent of the peninsula was thus brought by them under the authority of the Church. It was divided into parishes, each of which was provided with a chapel and a school-house, and where required, a glebe for the residence of the Franciscan Priest who was to officiate; and the ruins of these ecclesiastical edifices, even at the present day, attest the care and expenditure which must have been applied to their construction. In Jaffna itself, they had a college of Jesuits at the west end of the town, a church and a convent of S. Dominic on the east, besides a convent of S. Francis; and when the Dutch made themselves masters of the fortress, in 1658, there marched out, according to Baldæus, from forty to fifty ecclesiastics, Jesuits, Franciscans and Dominicans. In short, there is sufficient evidence extant connected with this province of Ceylon, to justify the assertion, that within a very few years from its occupation by the Portuguese, almost the entire population of the Jaffna peninsula, including even the Brahmans themselves, had abjured their idolatry, and submitted to the ceremony of Baptism."—pp. 13, 14.

And the progress of conversion among the Singhalese was equally encouraging. The kings of Kandy and Cotta embraced christianity, and received baptism at the hands of the clergy of Colombo and Manaar.

"On occasion of the latter, the emperor of Cotta being baptized," says the *Rajavali*, one of the sacred historical books of Ceylon, 'many of the nobles of Cotta were baptized likewise; and from this day forward, the women of the principal people, and also the women of the low castes,—the barbers, the fishers, the hinnawas, (mat-makers,) and chalias for the sake of Portuguese gold, began to turn Christians, and live with the Portuguese; and the priests of

Buddhu, who till now had remained in Cotta, retired into the interior, to Situak and Kandy.'"—p. 24.

If any more complete evidence is required of the extraordinary manner in which Christianity took root and flourished as soon as it was introduced into the island, it will be found in the fact insisted on by Sir Emerson, that "up to this day, the most distinguished families among the Singhalese chiefs bear, in addition to their own names, those of the Portuguese officers which were conferred on their ancestors at their baptism by the Roman Catholic clergy three centuries ago." (p. 28.) And that the Buddhist religion was in so weak and precarious a state that it was necessary afterwards to send to Arracan for fresh priests to support it, a measure to which the Dutch lent their approval and assistance purposely, in order to counteract and make up for Catholic influence.

The extent and rapidity with which Catholicism grew and prevailed under the Portuguese is then an undeniable fact, and one of so striking a character, that Sir Emerson conceives, as indeed every Protestant must, that it requires explanation. That Mahometanism should prevail there in the Middle Ages, so as even to extinguish Christianity, is not only a conceivable supposition, but so extremely probable in the eyes of Sir Emerson as to be taken for granted. That the Baptists, Presbyterians, Wesleyans, Independents, and other denominations do not carry all before them is to him a matter of astonishment. But that Catholicism, a religion which Great Britain had rejected, and with which he himself had no sympathy, should have made such progress, and taken a strong hold on the people, is exceedingly awkward and vexatious. Without an explanation, it would not do at all to publish so unpalatable a truth.

Accordingly, he gives us various little charitable suggestions, as to the motives which the natives had, or might have had, for being converted; the Rajavali says, it was for the sake of Portuguese gold. "Those," he tells us, "who are acquainted with the Singhalese, their obsequiousness, and the pliancy with which they can accommodate themselves to the wishes and opinions of those whom it may be their interest to conciliate, will have no difficulty in comprehending the ease with which the Roman Catholic clergy, &c." (p. 9.) "The imagination of the Sing-

halese became excited by the pompous pageantry of the Roman Catholic religion," (p. 15.) "The Catholics adapted their religion to the country,—their ceremonies and processions differed only in name from those of the heathen." (p. 22.) "Their tenets and doctrines too were similar; their adhesion was the result of political conformity, not of religious conviction, and along with the profession of their new faith, they cherished a still closer attachment to the superstitions of Buddhism." He speaks, (p. 77,) of the "era of artifice and corrupt inducement practised by the early priesthood of Portugal;" and still more plainly in another passage:

"It is difficult on any other ground to account satisfactorily for the readiness with which so many thousands of the Singhalese consented, almost without solicitation, and altogether without conviction or enlightenment, to adopt a religion which was so utterly new, and whose tenets must have been so entirely unknown to them. It was, in fact, an adoption without a surrender of opinion; and if scruples were seriously felt respecting the change, they must have been speedily overcome by the prospect of personal advancement, and by the attractions of a religion which, in point of pomp and magnificence, surpassed, without materially differing from the pageantry and processions with which they were accustomed to celebrate the festivals of their own national faith."—p. 29.

Such are the private opinions of the late Colonial Secretary respecting the causes of the conversion of the Singhalese. We need nothing more for their complete refutation than to quote not the *opinions* but the *facts* which he himself furnishes. First as to the charge of the Portuguese gold. We will not insist on the interest which the sacred books would have to make out such a case, nor on the transparency of making out the women to have been bribed, when from their circumstances they would have been less exposed to such influences than the men; but we will quote one or two passages from his own book on the subject.

If the natives of Ceylon became Catholics from corrupt and sordid motives, or from the influence of authority under the Portuguese, the Dutch ought to have been equally, not to say a great deal more successful in making converts. For according to Sir Emerson they made use of these instruments to a much greater extent than their predecessors.

"Cordiner," he says, "must have been but imperfectly informed, when he states that the Portuguese compelled the natives of Ceylon to adopt the Roman Catholic religion without consulting their inclination, and that the Dutch, unlike them, had refrained from the employment of open force for the propagation of their religious faith; and Hough, in his important work on Christianity in India, has adopted his assertions without due examination. *On both points the historical evidence is at variance with these representations. I have discovered nothing in the proceedings of the Portuguese in Ceylon to justify the imputation of violence and constraint; but unfortunately as regards the Dutch Presbyterians, their own words are conclusive as to the severity of their measures, and the ill success by which they were followed.*" p. 65.

Again, in a note at the foot of page 42, he observes:

"The only writer who has ventured to do any justice to the conduct of the Portuguese in regard to religion, as compared to that of the Dutch in the same particular, is the Rev. Mr. Bissett, who, under the name of Philalethes, published in 1815, an account of Ceylon, in which he guardedly observes, that the Portuguese were more tolerant in religion than the Dutch, and the Dutch were less tolerant than they ought."

And again:

"The same fury against the Church of Rome continued at all times to inspire the policy of the Dutch in Ceylon; and their resistance to its priesthood was even more distinct and emphatic than their condemnation of the *Buddhists and Brahmans*. In 1658, a proclamation was issued forbidding on pain of death the harbouring or concealing of a Roman Catholic Priest; but such a threat was too iniquitous to be carried into execution, and the Priests continued their ministrations in defiance of the law. In 1715, a proclamation was issued prohibiting public assemblies, or private conventicles of the Roman Catholics, under heavy fines for the first and second offence, and chastisement at the discretion of the magistrate for the third. In the same year by a plakaat which was afterwards renewed from time to time, it was forbidden for a Catholic clergyman to administer baptism under any circumstances; and in 1773, the proclamation of 1658 was republished against entertaining or giving lodging to a Priest, but with no better success; for twelve years later the same sanguinary order had to be repeated by a fresh plakaat of the governor. In 1748, it was forbidden to educate a Roman Catholic for the ministry; but within three years it was found necessary to repeat the same prohibition, as well as to renew the proclamation for putting down the celebration of Mass. Notwithstanding every persecution, however, the Roman Catholic religion retained its influence, and held good its position in Ceylon.

It was openly professed by the immediate descendants of the Portuguese, who had remained in the island after its conquest by the Dutch; and in private it was equally adhered to by large bodies of the natives, both Singhalese and Tamils, *whom neither corruption nor coercion could induce to abjure it.*"—pp. 41-2.

Sir Emerson tells us the exact means of corruption that were used "to quicken their apprehension."

"With this view proclamation was publicly made that no native could aspire to the rank of Modliar, nor be even permitted to farm land or hold office under the government, who had not first undergone the ceremony of baptism, become a member of the Protestant Church and subscribed to the doctrines contained in the Helvetic confession of faith."—p. 45.

This system, we are told, had the effect of bringing many to a profession of the Dutch religion. Many of the 'Lowland Chiefs,' as well as the 'Landowners,' and those who aspired to be petty headmen and police vidahns of their villages, were prompt to show themselves qualified for office. How could it be otherwise? There ever will and must be tares growing together with the wheat. A proportion of imposters, Sir Emerson himself tells us, must be expected. Moreover, the greatest national failing of the Singhalese is a want of regard to the truth. And this leads them to have far too easy a conscience about outwardly professing one religion while they really adhere to another. Nay, they have even a theory, as Sir Emerson takes pains to shew, p. 240, for reconciling their consciences to this. But with all this, the effect of all the coercion and corruption of the Dutch was very small, according to Sir Emerson's own account. Mr. Palm, one of the Dutch Presbyterian ministers, avows that 'they designated the natives as nominal or baptized Christians, because many made a profession only from considerations of personal advantage, and that native (he should have said Dutch) Christianity throughout Ceylon was in an unsound and critical condition.' With regard, however, to the Catholics, Sir Emerson says:

"As the influence of the protestant clergy declined, that of the Roman Catholic Priesthood had risen into unexpected importance. Their worship, notwithstanding every discouragement, had maintained its hold on the natives by its gaudy ceremonial; whilst the less attractive and sterner discipline of the Dutch could only be sustained by prospects of personal advantage, or enforced by pecu-

niary fines. At Jaffna, in particular amongst the Tamils and Fisher caste along the Western coast, *its ascendancy was neither weakened by persecution not undermined by corruption.*"—p. 50.

Again he observes, p. 58 :

"It would appear that obstacles to the extension of Christianity from the influence of idolatry, were even less apprehended than the difficulties now encountered from the rising ascendancy of the Roman Catholics, *whose numbers had actually multiplied under persecution.*"

And he gives us so striking an account of the progress of Catholicism under this persecution, that at the risk of wearying our readers we shall transcribe it.

"From Kandy, where they had been alternately invited and proscribed by the kings, the Roman Catholic Priests made their way into the low country, visiting in secret their scattered flocks, and administering the sacraments in defiance of the plakaats and prohibitions of the government. Amongst the most distinguished of these preachers was Joseph Vaz, of the Oratory of St. Philippo Neri, at Goa, whose adventurous journeys and imprisonments, and his extraordinary zeal in the service of his Church, have obtained for his memory amongst the Roman Catholics of Ceylon, a veneration little short of that accorded to the name of St. Francis Xavier, in India. He prevailed on the king of Kandy, in 1694, to permit him to rebuild the Churches of the Roman Catholics, in the Bogambra suburb, which his predecessor had ordered to be destroyed ; and having been appointed by the bishop of Cochin his Vicar-general for Ceylon, he prosecuted his labours with such vigour and success, that in an incredibly short space of time he had re-established the Catholic communion in its former strongholds at Jaffna and Manaar, extended its influence in the maritime provinces, and added to the Church upwards of 30,000 converts from the heathen. Father Vaz died at Kandy, in 1711, but the impulse which his fervour and toil had communicated to the advancement of his religion, underwent no apparent diminution after his decease ; and at length the Dutch government, abandoning whatever portion of practical moderation may have characterized the earlier years of their rule, were persuaded by the protestant ministers to adopt a more active, but as it eventually proved an equally inefficient policy for the forcible suppression of Popery. The Dutch clergy and their consistory appear at all times to have been inclined to religious coercion ; but it was only when alarmed by the increasing pressure of the Roman Catholics, that the government yielded to their solicitations, and ventured to enforce the series of measures which have already been enumerated, *and which were designed not*

merely for the restraint of the Priests, but the actual extinction of the Roman Catholic religion in Ceylon. The Priests thus proscribed were however far from being silenced; they abandoned their opened residence in the territories of the Dutch, and retired to villages and towns on the Kandian frontier, whence they returned in various disguises to visit their congregations throughout the maritime districts. The proclamations of the government were either too late to be effectual, or too tyrannical to be carried into force, and in 1717, only two years after their renewed promulgation, the Roman Catholics were in possession of four hundred Churches in all parts of Ceylon, whilst the Dutch Presbyterians had barely one-fourth the number, either of congregations or converts. Other measures equally unwise and abortive followed those of 1715. Roman Catholic marriages were at first heavily taxed, and then ordered to be solemnized only by ministers of the Reformed Church, or by the officers of the court of justice; and all this proving ineffectual, their celebration by a Roman Catholic Priest was at last absolutely prohibited, and their registration declared void. Their burials were forbidden in cemeteries of their own, and extravagant fees were exacted on their interment in those attached to the protestant Churches. Roman Catholics were declared equally with heathens to be ineligible to office; and freedom was conferred upon the children of all slaves born of protestant parents, whilst those of Roman Catholics were condemned to perpetual servitude; a device so short-sighted, as to counteract the intentions of its framers by giving every slaveholder an interest in preventing the extension of Protestantism."—pp. 51-4.

And yet notwithstanding all this, their numbers, Sir Emerson tells us, increased under persecution, and not only so, but he adds:

"Whatever may have been the instrumentality resorted to by the Portuguese priesthood, and however objectionable the means adopted by them for the extension of their own form of Christianity, one fact is unquestionable, that the natives became speedily attached to their ceremonies and modes of worship, and adhered to them with remarkable tenacity for upwards of three hundred years; whilst even in the midst of their own ministrations the clergy and missionaries of the Reformed Church of Holland were overtaken by discouragement; and it is a remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the multitudinous baptisms of the hundreds of thousands of Singhalese who were enrolled by them as converts, the religion and discipline of the Dutch Presbyterians is now almost extinct amongst the natives of Ceylon."

Whatever, then, may be the private opinion of Sir Emerson on the subject, and however curious it may be to analyse the mind and thoughts of a man who within a

few pages refutes the assertions he had made, it is quite clear from his own repeated statements, that as a matter of fact, the Portuguese were successful and the Dutch were not successful in converting the Singhalese; secondly, that the means by which the former succeeded were not coercion and corruption, for they were used abundantly, and yet without success by the latter; and thirdly, that the work of the one endured under every discouragement and even severe persecution, while the little that was effected by the other fell speedily to pieces of itself.

It is not very common to find a man who is so straightforward and candid as Sir Emerson. He is too honest for himself. His facts are too much for him. He writes a book on Christianity in Ceylon, and really the result of his investigations is most unpleasant. Those who read his book will see that Catholicism immediately took root and sprung up, no one could tell how; while Protestantism, the religion of the British empire, the most enlightened religion of the greatest power in the world, could not be made to succeed. This will not do at all. At least if the facts cannot be altered they must be explained. And so he returns once more to the attack, and suggests that the conversion of the natives was hollow and insincere. The change was little else, he tells us, than one in name. The Singhalese were attracted by the gaudy ceremonial of Rome. The fact was, Sir Emerson has found it all out, there was no need for a change at all. The Catholic Church is so like Buddhism, and Buddhism so like the Catholic Church, that the natives had only half a step to take from one to the other.

"Buddhism," he says, "like the ceremonial of the Church of Rome, has to some extent its pageantry and its decorations, its festivals and its fireworks, its processions, its perfumes, its images, its exhibition of relics, its sacred vestments, and its treasures of 'barbaric pearl and gold.' It has its holy places and its pilgrimages in prosperity and in health, and its votive offerings in calamity and disease. The priests of both are devoted to celibacy and poverty, to mortification and privation. Each worship has its prostrations and its genuflections, its repetitions and invocations in an ancient, and to the multitude, in an unintelligible tongue: and the purgatory of the one has a counterpart in the transmigrations of the other. Both have their legends and their miracles, their confidence in charms, and in the assistance of guardian Saints and protectors: and in the general aspect of their outward observances, not less than

in the concurrence of many of their leading beliefs, it is with the least conceivable violence to established customs, and the slightest apparent disturbance of preconceived ideas, that the Buddhist finds himself at liberty to venture on the transition from his own faith to that of his new advisers."—p. 95.

Here again as to his facts Sir Emerson is tolerably correct. Not only have both systems their feasts, their relics, their offerings, and their priests devoted to celibacy and poverty, not only are 'the votaries' of the one as well as the other taught to kneel down when they say their prayers, but it is true that the 'leading beliefs,' as he calls them, of the two religions coincide. Both, for instance, believe that man has a soul, that he will live in a future state, that there is not only a purgatory, but a heaven and a hell, in which men will be rewarded or punished. Not only this we say, but there are some really curious approximations to the truth, which it will be interesting and instructive to draw out. If the above passage is brought to prove that the counterfeit resembles the genuine, we easily admit so common a truism. We will even found an argument upon it, and superinduce a practical conclusion. If, on the other hand, he would insinuate that the Catholic religion itself was bent and adapted to suit the tastes and belief of the Singhalese, then why does not the Church, in pursuance of the same policy, adapt herself to the state of public opinion in the present day? Why will she be so old-fashioned? Why will she persist in retaining all her ancient mummeries in these enlightened times, and not rather suit herself to the altered circumstances of the day, to the haughty scepticism of France, or the Protestantism of England?

We will enquire then, from the materials Sir Emerson himself affords us, into the reality and sincerity of the Catholic conversions in Ceylon. He shall furnish us with the tests of true conversion, and shall himself apply them. The reality of conversions may be tried by an enquiry into their durability, into the morality of the converts, their abstaining from heathen observances and customs, their giving up their substance for the support of their new faith, and their enduring persecution. These are the very reasonable and yet searching tests, Sir Emerson speaks of in different parts of his work. First, we will quote the passage immediately following our last quotation, which a reader uninitiated into Sir Emerson's style, might fancy from a certain important little monosyllable, was intended

to be confirmatory of, instead of directly contradictory to, the genius and spirit of what had gone before.

"One remarkable circumstance, too, is observable in their converts, however meagre may be their acquaintance with Christianity—that the number of nominal Christians who still adhere in secret to the rites and tenets of Buddhism, is infinitely smaller amongst the Roman Catholics than amongst the professors of any other Church in Ceylon; an incident which has been ascribed to the overruling influence of the confessional, and the unintermitted control which it exerts over the feelings as well as the actions of its votaries. *In fact, if any evidence were wanting to substantiate the real ascendancy thus acquired and maintained by the Church of Rome, it would be found in the munificence with which the natives contribute habitually for its support, and the liberality which they have manifested in the erection of costly chapels and highly decorated altars for its worship.* It is due likewise to its priesthood to declare that whatever may be their individual feelings towards protestantism and its agents, they have carried on their operations in Ceylon with an absence of active jealousy.....Harvard, himself a protestant missionary, has borne his willing testimony to the sincerity and demeanour of the Roman Catholic converts, whom he describes '*as more detached from the customs of paganism, more regular in their attendance on the religious services of Christianity, and in their general conduct more consistent with the moral precepts of the Gospel than any other religious body of any magnitude in Ceylon.*' However merited may have been this testimony of Mr. Harvard, or however truthful as regards the comparative claims of the several Christian communities at the time when it was written, the thirty years which have since elapsed have so far altered their relative aspects, that the converts of the Roman Catholic Church may fairly rest their moral reputation on their own merits, without being indebted to a comparison invidiously instituted with those of others, who in point of conduct and Christian bearing, exhibit no evidences of inferiority."—p. 96 and 97.

And in the next page, speaking of Christianity under 'its least purified form,' he says:

"Even as an agent of social progress, its importance is self-apparent, and however superficial may be their religious convictions on the part of the great mass of the population, there are to be found amongst the Roman Catholic Singhalese, men whose morality is as undoubted as their attachment to the forms of their adopted religion is sincere, and whose conduct and demeanour as Christians are as consistent and becoming as those of any other sect in Ceylon."—p. 99.

Other tests of the reality of the conversions are their

durability and standing persecution, but it is unnecessary to enlarge on these, as it has been shown from the passages already adduced, that the natives of Ceylon underwent persecution even to blood, first from the heathen, and afterwards from the Dutch and English; that their numbers actually increased under persecution, that neither coercion nor corruption could induce them to renounce their faith, and that they are now by far the greatest community of Christians in the island; while of the Dutch, he himself says, that when the English missionary bodies arrived between the years 1812 and 1818, 'the protestant form of Christianity, and certainly its purity and influence, might be considered almost extinct.' Let us however apply one more test.

"It may be taken," says Sir Emerson, "as a demonstrative evidence of a certain amount of sincerity in avowed converts, when they attest it by their willingness to contribute from their pecuniary resources to the support of the form of Christianity which they have embraced."—p. 298, note.

Such is the principle, a true and fair one, which he brings forward to prove the sincerity of some of the protestant converts. Immediately after he subjoins the minor premise.

"The Roman Catholic converts are by far the most willing to contribute from their own means to the support of their clergy and churches, and their donations for these purposes are on a scale of extreme liberality."—p. 299.

And he incidentally relates in the first chapter of his book, an extraordinary instance of this. In 1840, the British Government in Ceylon remitted the tax on fish, which amounted to about £6000 annually, a great sum to come from these poor men. The fishers however determined instead of benefitting by this themselves, to transfer the tax to the Catholic priests, by whom it has been collected, or farmed for collection, ever since. It should be mentioned that the Fisher caste were among the first to embrace Christianity, and are now almost all Catholics.

We have seen the extraordinary success of the Catholic missions of Ceylon. Let us next briefly enquire from Sir Emerson what were the results of the attempts to convert the natives to protestantism. Let us apply the tests *here*:

Some passages have already been quoted with respect to the Dutch, to show that the progress of conversion was, to use his own words, "unsatisfactory and unsound." In page 56, he gives us a quotation from the records of the Dutch Consistory at Galle, in which it is stated that the native chiefs, though they had in compliance with the wishes of Government assumed the designation of Christians, were still "incorrigible Buddhists," and it goes on, to set forth at length all the numerous practices and superstitions not only of Buddhism, but of Devil worship, which were as habitual with these 'professing Christians,' as if they had never been converted at all. Among the Tamils of Jaffna the Dutch seem to have been more successful; yet according to their own official accounts, as well as the opinions of historians of the period, they were for the most part 'merely Christians in name;' 'their profession was unsound,' and the converts themselves were "*sine Christo Christiani*," p. 65. A little further on he says:

"Even in the midst of their own ministrations, the clergy and missionaries of Holland were overtaken with discouragement, and it is a remarkable fact, that notwithstanding the multitudinous baptisms, and the hundreds of thousands of Singhalese who were enrolled by them as converts, the religion and discipline of the Dutch presbyterians is now almost extinct amongst the natives of Ceylon. Even in Jaffna, where the reception of these doctrines was all but unanimous by the Tamils, not a single congregation is now in existence of the many planted by Baldæus, and tended by the labours of Valentyn and Schwartz: and in Colombo, and throughout the maritime provinces, there are not at this moment fifty native Singhalese, even amongst the aged and infirm, who still profess the form of religion so authoritatively established and so anxiously propounded by the Dutch."—pp. 67-8.

At the end of the chapter in which this passage occurs, Sir Emerson makes some reflections on the missionary efforts of the Dutch, and concludes by saying, that 'at the close of their ministrations the clergy of Holland left behind a superstructure of Christianity, prodigious in its outward dimensions, but so internally unsound as to be distrusted even by those who had been instrumental in its erection, and so unsubstantial that it has long since disappeared, almost from the memory of the natives of Ceylon.'

Turn we next to consider the success of the mission of the Americans and the English. Of these Sir Emerson

throughout his book speaks in the very highest terms. He describes the work undertaken by each. He enumerates those who had most distinguished themselves for zeal and energy, and passes the highest encomiums on their self-devotion. Nor are we disposed to underrate the efforts they have made. We know from other sources besides Sir Emerson's book, that the missionary establishments of protestants in Ceylon are carried out on a most magnificent scale. We have seen in the men who conducted them a zeal to admire, and a devotion worthy of a better cause. No pains have been spared, that human ingenuity or worldly wisdom could devise. There has been a Paul to plant and an Apollos to water. One thing alone they had not and could not have—God to give the increase.

That such is the case is perfectly plain from Sir Emerson's own statements. "The clergy of the Church of England," he says, p. 168, "are equally (with the Wesleyans) indefatigable in their labours amongst the heathen, but although the section of the peninsula which is occupied by their mission, contains a dense population of upwards of 30,000 Tamils, the number who ordinarily attend their ministrations seldom exceeds an average of twenty individuals."

"I come now," he continues, "to the enquiry, *what has been the practical effect* of this system upon the minds and morals of the Tamil natives of Ceylon? And looking first to the declarations of the American mission as the most extensive in its operations, as well as the most comprehensive in its experience, I am bound to declare that as yet the ostensible result of their labours falls far short of the expectation which might have been formed from their magnitude and zeal."—p. 169.

After the American mission the Baptists are considered by him to rank next in their success, as well as in importance. They occupy one hundred and thirty villages, they have thirty-five schools, with an attendance of eight hundred and thirty pupils, and have fourteen missionaries, yet the number of converts whom they have admitted to communion, amount to but four hundred and fifty one. They established a printing press in Kandy in 1841. But 'the moral results,' observes Sir Emerson, 'have been limited and unsatisfactory, although industriously applied to the multiplication of the Scriptures and Scriptural tracts.' The Wesleyans have been at work there since 1814, and

are abundantly furnished with all human means for the conversion of the natives, yet the number whom they have admitted into full membership with their body, is, according to their own account, but little over a thousand. The Church of England mission has an establishment in Ceylon, which is carried on at an annual expense of £10,000, as we have been informed, to the home society. Yet a mission had been opened for years in the Kandyan province, before a single Kandyan could be got to attend. The Bishop of Calcutta visited it in 1831, and confirmed thirty-six converts; and he cautiously remarks, that he found there '*sufficient to encourage but nothing to elate them.*' 'The number of actual converts,' we are told, 'are few,' and 'the avowals of innate conviction rare.' Then as to the character of those who profess themselves converts, Sir Emerson says that 'idolatry is too often replaced by infidelity,' and that 'the missionaries themselves are fully aware of the fact, that amongst their nominal adherents there are numbers whose life and inward feelings are at variance with their seeming profession.'

This want of success, disheartening as it must be to the protestant missionaries, is not only fully admitted by Sir Emerson, who certainly would not do so unnecessarily, but it is also candidly acknowledged, as we have had opportunities of knowing, by some of the most sincere and zealous of themselves. They look upon the real number of souls saved as *very* small.

We have not now the time to follow Sir Emerson in the sketches he gives us of the Buddhist and Brahminical religions; but the history of 'Christianity in Ceylon,' and the simple statement of facts as they may be gathered from the book, is too instructive to pass over entirely without comment. Here is an instance such as we often desiderate. Protestantism in its many forms, and Catholicism in its one, tested each of them their separate strength, and vitality in Ceylon. It was a favourable field for the trial. There were two nations for them to work upon of widely dissimilar character and genius. During the space of nearly three hundred and fifty years, the government and fortunes of the island have been sufficiently varied to afford every combination of circumstances that would foster or put to trial the two religions. One exception indeed must be made, for protestantism has never once

during all this time met with anything approaching to persecution. Yet Catholicism at once took root and flourished there, while protestantism has never had more than the semblance of an existence. And what is the natural conclusion? Our Lord likens his Church to good seed, that a man sowed in his field, and which sprung up, he knew not how, and took root. But if with every natural and artificial advantage, if with light, and air, and sunshine, if with protection from cold and storm, and every facility for forcing growth, still the seed remains barren and unproductive, what can we suppose but that there is a want of vitality? And so indeed it is. Protestantism has no life in itself. It is, what its name imports, a negative religion. It may indeed take life elsewhere and graft its evil nature on another stock. But let it be sent out among the heathen to set up for itself, and on its own resources, and it fails.

Or we may view the subject in another light. Sir Emerson searches about for some sufficient reason to account for Protestantism not *taking* among the natives of Ceylon. It may perhaps be, he thinks, that preaching is not quite enough attended to, or that the intellect must be cultivated before religion can be received. Yet what an utterly insufficient account of the matter. Let a man travel through Ceylon. He comes to a protestant missionary station. It is like a little village. There is a large Church or Chapel, houses for the missionaries, schools for boys and girls, and perhaps a large College as well for native teachers, with houses for the masters. In several places a printing establishment and charitable institutions for the sick and poor. The whole is going on with the regularity of machinery, often with a good deal of energy, and at the annual cost of some thousands. He next visits the Catholic chapel, which he generally finds in the least fashionable part of the town, and sees one or two small rooms built on to it, which are, he is told, the Priest's house. The Priest is a plain simple man, with perhaps but little learning and less worldly wisdom, and his sole means for the support of himself and the expenses of the chapel, are the *half-farthings* of his poor congregation. Yet while the Baptist or Wesleyan has but few converts at all, and fewer that he can think of with any satisfaction, the Priest will tell you that he has not only a congregation of some hundreds or thousands round him, but several others in

different places at a distance, and that if there were more priests in the island, or but *one* seminary for native teachers and missionaries, they would be able to receive into the Church thousands more souls, who need more the opportunity than the disposition. How, we say again, is so great a difference to be accounted for, but that the God of nature who formed man and regulated his passions and affections to suit his external condition, made likewise the spiritual world, the system of grace and of religion, and suited it exactly to fill the cravings of our spiritual nature. The Singhalese do not feel *drawn* to Protestantism; they have no natural appetite for what it offers, and so the only way as Sir Emerson says, is by instruction. For as the intellect is cultivated, they may *learn* to want that which in their natural condition they care not for. But Catholicism they are attracted to, not as he thinks from 'its gaudy ceremonial,' but because under that outward form there is a soul and a reality which occupies the void which nature had formed in them. 'Strange as it may sound,' says Mr. Davies, a protestant missionary quoted by Sir Emerson, 'to those who have had no practical intercourse with unenlightened races, yet it is a fact, that when spoken to on the subjects of sin and salvation, of time and eternity, the attention of the Singhalese is more readily arrested, their resistance more easily subdued, than when addressed on the more ordinary topics of moral and economical instruction.' Strange indeed on protestant principles, but only natural to those of the Catholic.

'Mental debasement is,' indeed, as Sir Emerson says, 'unfavourable to the access of Christian truth,' but if we find a nation in a state of mental degradation, are we to wait till they are civilized before their conversion can be attempted? Are thousands and millions of souls to pass first into eternity without the means of grace or the hopes of salvation offered to them? Has the Maker and Redeemer of the poor provided no means by which the hearts of the ignorant and unenlightened may be reached? We doubt very much whether S. Peter and most of the Apostles were not in a state of what the world would denominate 'mental debasement,' when our Lord called them. And this may have been done purposely, in order to show us that Christianity was not like protestantism, a religion addressed to the intellect; a religion which never has and never can come home to the hearts, and alter the lives of the great

masses of the poor and ignorant, but that it is *Catholic*, a religion adapted for all ages and all countries, and all states of society; a religion that could soften the hearts and tame the passions of fierce hordes of barbarians, of Vandals and Goths, while it could at the same time overawe and keep in submission the intellect of a St. Austin and a St. Thomas.

On the whole, Sir Emerson comes to the conclusion, that the causes which prevented the conversion of the natives of Ceylon are twofold; first, the firm hold which their old superstitions still have on them; and secondly, the excessive apathy which they display, and which he looks upon as a greater obstacle than any that had to be contended against by the apostles themselves. However this may be, there is no doubt that the main difficulties are rightly stated by him. And how are they to be met? Protestantism has no weapons keen enough for the contest. Such obstacles as these can be overcome by nothing less than supernatural means. A few words on this subject may serve to put in a clearer point of view the weakness of Protestantism, and the strength of Catholicism, in converting the heathen, and shall conclude our present remarks.

When, therefore, Sir Emerson complains, as he repeatedly does, of 'the habitual apathy' 'and listless indifference to all religions' displayed by the Singhalese, we should like him to tell us how it is that this difficulty, great as it confessedly is, was overcome by the Catholic missionaries? Sir Emerson has not answered this question, which might, and which ought to have occurred to him. But the facts he has furnished us with, like the separate pieces of a puzzle, have only to be put together and the answer will come out of itself. First, the Singhalese are, he tells us, naturally shrewd and keen, and of very acute judgment. The Portuguese arrive, and having made themselves masters of a great part of the country, their first care is to bring missionaries and to plant the Church. Without persecuting the heathen religion of the island, they do all they can to discountenance it, as what is dangerous to the souls of men. The natives find that missionaries preaching the same doctrine, are going about on the continent of India, and they hear that they are men of extraordinary mortification of life, whose zeal is such, that labours and toils are as nothing to them. Afterwards

the Dutch come, and by a most flagrant act of perfidy, obtain a footing in the island (p. 39). Their first care is not to convert the heathen, but against the Catholics, to persecute and insult them. They see the Catholic converts bearing willingly loss of goods, and even of life for the sake of their religion. On the other hand they observe 'the licentious and offensive lives of the (Dutch) Europeans themselves, who encourage the natives in debauchery, and show them an example in the practice of every vice' (p. 57), as one of their own body complains. Moreover, they see the Dutch assisting the Buddhists to send one if not two embassies to a distance in order to revive their religion. The next phase of protestantism is under the British, who come without any missionaries or religion at all; who, provided they may be allowed to take possession of Ceylon, *guaranteed to the Singhalese by an express stipulation, the maintenance of their religion; whose soldiers mount guard daily over the tooth of Buddha; a part of whose revenue is paid annually for the performance of Buddhist ceremonies and devil worship; and one of whose first Governors took part in a Buddhist procession.* Then the British missionaries come over accompanied by 'their amiable ladies,' and appearing in the light of kind, charitable, and amiable men themselves; but they see in them nothing heroic, nothing supernatural, nothing of that austere self-denial that impresses on us the fact, whether we will or no, that here are men living not for this world, but for that which is unseen. Looking at all this, what is more easy and natural, than that the Singhalese, not being prejudiced by preconceived notions, should see in the one, messengers of God, to tell them of another world, while in the others, living as they did ordinary lives, and appearing in the light of benevolent ladies and gentlemen, respectable members of society, they saw nothing of a sufficiently startling character to rouse them from that apathy and indifference of which Sir Emerson complains.

A remarkable illustration of this view is afforded by Sir Emerson himself, in the account he gives us of a Mr. Daniel, a Baptist missionary. Mr. Daniel lived for some time in the capital of the island, and laboured among the natives in the ordinary way. Afterwards he met with some trials and lost his wife, and 'the bereaved old man,' we are told, 'as if nerved for bolder exertion by these disasters, shortly after changed the scene of his labours from

the civilization of the capital to the solitude of the forest.' For two years he employed himself in going about from village to village, preaching and instructing, and enduring many hardships, toils, and discouragements. And what was the result? The attention of the natives was roused. They began to talk of Mr. Daniel with curiosity. Afterwards they not only thought of him with interest, but spoke of him with respect and admiration, and he came at length to be looked up to and to gain an influence among them such as no other protestant missionary, that we have heard of has ever enjoyed. We have heard of a thoughtful Singhalese, though one that had no love for anything Catholic, who expressed his belief that if the Protestant ministers were unmarried, and lived more like Mr. Daniel, the effects of their ministrations among the heathen would be much greater. Sir Emerson deploras indeed the small results of his great labours, and Mr. Daniel candidly acknowledges with grief that 'success was at present denied them,' but we venture to affirm that had the truth of his doctrines been equal to his zeal in propagating them, it would not have been so.

This then, we take it, is one principle that must ever be kept in view, in attempting to convert the heathen; viz. that the only way of meeting apathy and indifference is by devotion and self-sacrifice. It is not reasonable to expect that men should be induced to leave their old ways, unless for some cause of a sufficiently stirring character. And it is of no use for men who come with no great pretensions, who are living like the rest of mankind, and making themselves at home in the world, to proclaim to others the necessity of renouncing it. Even in the first ages of the Church, when she was endowed with some special gifts for the conversion of the heathen, the apostles did not come before the world but as men who in their own persons shewed forth the truth of the doctrine they preached, and renounced all that could comfort and delight them in this world, because they looked forward to the happiness of the next.

The other cause to which Sir Emerson attributes the few conversions made by the protestants, is the firm hold which their present superstitions have on them. Though indeed this has not prevented the Catholic missionaries from succeeding, as we have already seen, yet it is regarded by him as an insurmountable barrier to the progress.

of Christianity, With regard to Brahminism, he says, that it is 'manifestly idle to suppose that the overthrow of that gigantic imposture can be ever effectually achieved till the foundations of the system have been shaken by the exposure of its imaginary science, and the explosion of its false and fanciful philosophy' (p. 139). And in another place (p. 173), he speaks of 'the first grand object' being 'to shake the confidence of the people in their own superstitions,' and speaks elsewhere (p. 196), of the truth having been 'successful' to a certain extent, because it had shaken the confidence of the people in their national faith, though it had not led them to embrace any form of Christianity. Now in all this we recognize, what we humbly conceive to be, a very false principle, viz. that the process of rejecting error is a previous and separate one to that of embracing truth, in other words, that infidelity is a step towards Christianity. Whereas we are fully convinced that no form of belief, however superstitious and degrading, which men hold in ignorance and sincerity, is so dangerous to the soul, or so displeasing in the sight of God, as infidelity, and that viewed as a state of mind, no soil is so barren, none so unhopeful from which to expect good, as one of unbelief.

And the reason is plain. Good has an existence of its own, evil has none; it is only an absence or a perverted condition of good. Hence the very worst superstitions have in them an element of good by which they live. The good, however small, is the essence of their existence. The evil, however great, is accidental. But root out all belief, and you also take away life. You have nothing left but a negative state of mind. You cannot now any longer *graft*, but must begin from the seed; nay, even the soil must be prepared. You must not only implant faith, but likewise that habit of mind in which alone faith lives and thrives.

When the Pagans were converted in the times of the Roman empire, the Christians did not destroy their temples, but cleansed them, and adapted them to their own use. And what was done with the material structures was but a type of the way in which they treated the spiritual ones. It is used as a reproach against the Catholic Church, that so many of her usages and ceremonies were borrowed from the Pagans, that so many of her doctrines were grafted on those of the Heathen. And the fact is

true, though the reproach is undeserved. We read in the Acts of the Apostles of an instance in which St. Paul himself made use of the superstitious belief of the people, to graft on it the true doctrine. And in modern times the Jesuits, the great apostles of conversion among the Heathen, have done the same, though it *may* perhaps be granted to Sir Emerson, that in individual instances they have gone somewhat too far. On the other hand, we do not know of a single instance of a nation converted first to no belief, and then to the true one. Among the natives of Ceylon, indeed, the Protestant missionaries, if they have followed out this system, have certainly succeeded in conducting their converts to the first stage. But we attribute this not so much, we confess, to the *manner* in which conversion has been attempted, as to the want of some plain and definite teaching to offer to their belief, to the want of something that shall awaken their spiritual natures, and go home to their hearts. In the multitude of sects, and the different doctrines that are set before them, 'the Singhalese,' Sir Emerson acknowledges, 'can discover little more than that they are offered something still doubtful and unsettled, in exchange for which they are pressed to surrender their ancient superstitions.' 'The choice of sects,' he says again, 'leads to utter bewilderment.' 'Idolatry is too often replaced by infidelity,' p. 235. 'Instances are not rare,' he says in another place, p. 277, 'in which the scholars reared by these devout and untiring men, so far from returning their care by an alliance with their objects, have proved, by their scepticism and infidelity, more dangerous enemies to the truth than even heathenism itself.' It ought, indeed, to be an instructive lesson to the Protestants, that some of their most highly educated converts in Ceylon have become Catholics, while others have become Infidels.

This, then, is the second principle that we would lay down in the conversion of the Heathen, that in contradistinction to Sir Emerson's plan, their present belief and superstition should be made use of as the groundwork of the truth. No doubt this is more or less practicable in different cases; and 'the process,' as he says, 'must be adjusted to the subject.' In the case of Ceylon there are extraordinary advantages for carrying out this system. In many respects there is in the Buddhist religion a very close resemblance to the truth. Sir Emerson has made

this the ground of his uncharitable suggestion, that the natives found Catholic doctrines and ceremonies so similar to their own, that they did not need to make a change except in name. We wish this were so. But we fear that the natives will always find a great deal to change both in heart and belief, in becoming Catholics. We admit, however, that there is, from whatever source derived, a great deal in the popular belief, as well as in the doctrines of Buddhism, that contains at least the essence and germ of the truth, and requires not so much to be unlearned as to be purified, explained, brought out, and elevated. We will give some examples.

Sir Emerson tells us that "the doctrines of Buddha recognize the full eligibility of every individual born into the world for the attainment of the highest degrees of intellectual perfection and ultimate bliss." They recognize, too, the doctrine that man is here in a state of probation, and that, according to his conduct here, he will pass into a more or less happy state of existence. As to the next world, they "believe in the existence of lokas, or heavens, each differing in glory, and serving as the temporary residences of demigods and divinities, as well as of men whose etherialization is but inchoate, and who have yet to revisit the earth in future births, and acquire, in future transmigrations, their complete attainment of Nirwana. They believe, likewise, in the existence of hells, which are the abodes of demons, or tormentors, and in which the wicked undergo a purgatorial imprisonment preparatory to an extended probation upon earth. Here their torments are in proportion to their crimes, and although not eternal, their duration extends almost to the infinitude of eternity; those who have been guilty of the deadliest sins of parricide, sacrilege, and defiance of the faith, being doomed to the endurance of excruciating deaths, followed by instant revival, and a repetition of their tortures without mitigation, and apparently without end."—pp. 212-13.

The *Nirwana* he speaks of has given occasion to much controversy as to whether the Buddhists recognize the immortality of the soul, as some take it to mean *extinction* or *annihilation*. For ourselves we incline to the belief that it means absorption into the Divine essence. Here indeed they go wrong, in making the highest bliss of heaven to involve the loss of personal existence. But this is the

less surprising, as even the Supreme Being is, in their belief, almost, perhaps entirely, without personality. God is regarded by them as too far off to take interest in the things of the world. Men are ruled by immutable laws of good and evil, or as it is sometimes expressed by fate, their good and bad actions having certain moral consequences attending them. Works of kindness and charity gain merit, and procure reward. Bad actions, as they regard them—for their code of morality is, *in some points*, exceedingly loose—deserve, and will inevitably meet with punishment. To a certain extent, indeed, they seem to believe that their actions are ruled by fate; but if only they could be taught that God had a personal existence, and interfered in the affairs of men, which miracles would surely impress upon them, they might easily be led to believe that their actions depend, not on the immutable decrees of fate, but on the gift of God's grace, and the doctrine of atonement, which they appear to have no notion about, would not then seem so unnatural to them.

Their veneration for sanctity, and their idea of the priesthood as those who are given up to a holy life, is very remarkable. We will quote once more.

"Buddhism accords honour to all in proportion to their approaches towards absolute wisdom, and the extinction of all the desires and passions of humanity; and as the realization of this perfection is regarded as almost hopeless in a life devoted to secular cares, the priests of Buddhu, on assuming their robe and tonsure, forswear all earthly occupations, subsist on alms, not in money, but in food, devote themselves to meditation and self-denial, and being thus proclaimed and recognized as the most successful aspirants to Nirwana, they claim the homage of ordinary mortals, acknowledge no superior upon earth, and withhold even the tribute of a salutation from all except the members of their own religious order."—p. 216.

As to outward ceremonies and religious usages, we have already quoted a passage in which Sir Emerson insists on the close similarity between them and those of the Catholic Church. But we have no space to pursue this very interesting subject further, or to give more than the merest outline of the features of Buddhism; and we are the less inclined to take notice of these lesser points of similarity, because these are properly viewed by them, not as the essentials, but only the accidentals of religion.

this the ground of his uncharitable suggestion, that the natives found Catholic doctrines and ceremonies so similar to their own, that they did not need to make a change except in name. We wish this were so. But we fear that the natives will always find a great deal to change both in heart and belief, in becoming Catholics. We admit, however, that there is, from whatever source derived, a great deal in the popular belief, as well as in the doctrines of Buddhism, that contains at least the essence and germ of the truth, and requires not so much to be unlearned as to be purified, explained, brought out, and elevated. We will give some examples.

Sir Emerson tells us that "the doctrines of Buddha recognize the full eligibility of every individual born into the world for the attainment of the highest degrees of intellectual perfection and ultimate bliss." They recognize, too, the doctrine that man is here in a state of probation, and that, according to his conduct here, he will pass into a more or less happy state of existence. As to the next world, they "believe in the existence of lokas, or heavens, each differing in glory, and serving as the temporary residences of demigods and divinities, as well as of men whose etherialization is but inchoate, and who have yet to revisit the earth in future births, and acquire, in future transmigrations, their complete attainment of Nirwana. They believe, likewise, in the existence of hells, which are the abodes of demons, or tormentors, and in which the wicked undergo a purgatorial imprisonment preparatory to an extended probation upon earth. Here their torments are in proportion to their crimes, and although not eternal, their duration extends almost to the infinitude of eternity; those who have been guilty of the deadliest sins of parricide, sacrilege, and defiance of the faith, being doomed to the endurance of excruciating deaths, followed by instant revival, and a repetition of their tortures without mitigation, and apparently without end."—pp. 212-13.

The *Nirwana* he speaks of has given occasion to much controversy as to whether the Buddhists recognize the immortality of the soul, as some take it to mean *extinction* or *annihilation*. For ourselves we incline to the belief that it means absorption into the Divine essence. Here indeed they go wrong, in making the highest bliss of heaven to involve the loss of personal existence. But this is the

less surprising, as even the Supreme Being is, in their belief, almost, perhaps entirely, without personality. God is regarded by them as too far off to take interest in the things of the world. Men are ruled by immutable laws of good and evil, or as it is sometimes expressed by fate, their good and bad actions having certain moral consequences attending them. Works of kindness and charity gain merit, and procure reward. Bad actions, as they regard them—for their code of morality is, *in some points*, exceedingly loose—deserve, and will inevitably meet with punishment. To a certain extent, indeed, they seem to believe that their actions are ruled by fate; but if only they could be taught that God had a personal existence, and interfered in the affairs of men, which miracles would surely impress upon them, they might easily be led to believe that their actions depend, not on the immutable decrees of fate, but on the gift of God's grace, and the doctrine of atonement, which they appear to have no notion about, would not then seem so unnatural to them.

Their veneration for sanctity, and their idea of the priesthood as those who are given up to a holy life, is very remarkable. We will quote once more.

"Buddhism accords honour to all in proportion to their approaches towards absolute wisdom, and the extinction of all the desires and passions of humanity; and as the realization of this perfection is regarded as almost hopeless in a life devoted to secular cares, the priests of Buddhu, on assuming their robe and tonsure, forswear all earthly occupations, subsist on alms, not in money, but in food, devote themselves to meditation and self-denial, and being thus proclaimed and recognized as the most successful aspirants to Nirwana, they claim the homage of ordinary mortals, acknowledge no superior upon earth, and withhold even the tribute of a salutation from all except the members of their own religious order."—p. 216.

As to outward ceremonies and religious usages, we have already quoted a passage in which Sir Emerson insists on the close similarity between them and those of the Catholic Church. But we have no space to pursue this very interesting subject further, or to give more than the merest outline of the features of Buddhism; and we are the less inclined to take notice of these lesser points of similarity, because these are properly viewed by them, not as the essentials, but only the accidentals of religion.

"Salvation," says Colonel Sykes, speaking of Buddhism, "is made dependent, not upon the practice of idle ceremonies, the repeating of prayers, or of hymns, or invocations to pretended gods, but upon moral qualifications, which constitute individual and social happiness here, and ensure it hereafter."—p. 221.

And Sir Emerson tells us, that when Buddhism was failing, and an attempt was made to arouse the attention, and excite the enthusiasm of the Buddhists by the adoption of ceremonies and processions, these, so far from being all-powerful with the people, were understood by them to be the innovations of priestcraft, or at least to have less of a religious than a secular character.

Without attempting to draw out a complete account of so difficult and obscure a subject as Buddhism, enough has been said to show the thoughtful reader that in the present superstitious and popular belief of the Singhalese, there is a most excellent soil on which to plant the truth. Of the two it is much easier, we conceive, to learn than to unlearn. To get rid of old associations, most especially in the case of the ignorant and unintellectual, is most difficult. To raise up new associations on the foundation of the old is comparatively easy. Looking then at the matter in a human point of view, we cannot but regard it as so much labour saved, and progress gained, that such a foundation already exists. True it is that it is not from human means, but from the grace of God, through human means, that success must be expected. Yet the present condition, no less than the past history of Ceylon, shew us, we say it gratefully, and yet mournfully, that in this case God has been waiting for man, and not man for God.

ART V.—*A History of the Romans under the Empire*. By CHARLES MERIVALE, B.D. Vols. 1 and 2. London, Longman, Brown, Green, and Longmans. 1850.

THERE are few periods of history more instructive than the last century of the Roman Republic. It was a century of reforms, both judicial and political. It

was a period of struggling principles: democracy or oligarchy, Rome or Italy, being the adverse war-cries. It was a century of conspiracies and revolutions: freedom had degenerated into licentiousness; the former tillers of the soil had gone to reap the harvest of war, or, returning home, swelled the ranks of idlers and rioters in the forum of Rome. The nation had grown out of its old habits, and yet knew not how to adapt itself to new practices. The Gracchi attempted to solve the problem by law, and perished. The sword was equally unsuccessful. Tumult followed tumult, war succeeded war: yet matters had only become more entangled. The Italians, indeed, had been satisfied or crushed; but even in the calmer interval between Catiline's death and the first Triumvirate, men were accustomed to see the law set at nought even by those that were its official guardians; and set at nought with impunity: what they thus learned to despise, they scrupled not to violate. Civil dissention with its innumerable private wrongs and public disasters, continually increased, until open hostilities shook the whole empire; and oligarchy and democracy alike perished, and Cato, Pompey, Cæsar, Brutus, Antony, added each his bloody death to tell the varying but relentless nature of the strife, and to prepare the way for that imperial despotism that seemed the only refuge from anarchy, and the only means of scaring back from Italy the vultures of Germany and Sarmatia.

Such is but the opening of the period which Mr. Merivale has undertaken to delineate. His object is to trace out the history of Rome from, what is generally termed, the first Triumvirate, to the age of Constantine. At present, however, his history terminates with the death of Julius Cæsar.

It is to be regretted that he has not distinctly shewn the nature of his authorities. An ordinary reader, seeing references constantly made, for more than a hundred pages, to Appian and Dion, and sometimes even to Orosius, would, perhaps, be inclined to take these writers for contemporary witnesses, instead of being compilers that lived two, or even six, centuries after the events which they narrated.

Of the five hundred pages of the first volume, about two hundred are filled with introductory topics. Upon only one or two of these can we pause to descant;—selected from among many others which betray some want of

caution, and yet a decision of tone, as strongly marked as if no solid reason for hesitation could possibly exist. In one of these passages, for instance, Mr. Merivale concludes in reference to the Italian war, that "the result of the contest was every way worthy of their (the Romans') military and political reputation. Successful every where in the field, they paused at the moment of victory, and to each nation, as it resigned its claims, presented the boon of citizenship as a free gift. The whole of Italy received the full franchise of the city." (p. 15.)

Now whatever may have been the military, where was the political, ability in all this? The Italians had long sought by legal means for the freedom of the city. They became, at last, impatient, and flew to arms. Rome for a time seemed tottering, but, finally, prevailed; and now granted what it had before refused. Where is there even ordinary policy in such conduct? Why not grant peaceably if the demand be just? Why grant at all if the demand be unjust?

In the second passage referred to we are told, that the advocates of "the restoration of the tribunitian prerogatives, and the *Judicia*," were "on the side of justice and substantial power." (pp. 66-7.) Is this so evident that it may be thus broadly stated?

Sylla's laws had stripped the tribunes of the privilege of proposing any bill, or of addressing the people upon any subject. Now what necessity of the state demanded a restoration of what had thus been taken away? The tribunes had acquired the root of their formidable power, their personal inviolability, for the protection of the "Plebs." That Plebs had now for centuries enjoyed the full privilege of citizenship, and free admission to the highest offices: their old protectors were no longer needed as protectors. Were they needed for the exercise of the Veto? The laws of Sylla had retained it.

In that age of faction, it is true, the full power of the tribunes in the hands of incorruptible men, would be of the highest benefit. Yet where were such to be found? Integrity was a virtue of the rarest growth; rarer than even in the days of Jugurtha. If, however, incorruptible men abounded, they could no longer use their powers with security: the inviolability of the tribune's character was all but lost: his person was still legally, but not practically, sacred. So Octavius found when he resisted Sempronius

Gracchus ; so Saturninus found when he poured out his blood beneath the Capitol ; so the younger Drusus found when the assassin's knife struck him in the crowd of his friends ; so Publius Sulpicius, when his head (despite of his 3000 hired gladiators) was cut off, and carried upon a pole in triumph. With such dangers and so little security, and this in an age notorious for bribery and open violence and bloodshed, the tribunes would either be silenced, or become the tools of factious men ; or else they, themselves, like Clodius, would become the leaders of factions. There are grave reasons, then, for supposing that the restoration of the contested privileges would neither be on the side of justice nor expediency. If there are grave reasons on the opposite side of the question, still the reverse should not be ignored as if it did not exist.

To hasten then to the formation of the first Triumvirate. Crassus and Pompey were, at that time, the leading men in the state ; but were at variance with a majority in the Senate, and with one another. Cæsar's influence lay principally in his popularity. Being an avowed admirer of Marius, he found it his interest to escape the wrath of the Senate, by bringing about a reconciliation between Pompey and Crassus. On this occasion all three pledged themselves to support one another, and agreed that, if any one of them disliked any measure, they should all three combine with the whole weight of their influence to crush it. It was evident that few measures could pass when opposed by men of such wealth, station, and popularity : they would thus become the virtual rulers of the state, and the dispensers of its offices and dignities. In this manner, without confusion, and, for a time, almost unobserved, they planned and completed a signal revolution. Such a triumvirate Marius had attempted to form with less craft and greater violence. His rash attempt ended in speedy confusion ; for his own safety he was obliged to turn upon Glaucia and Saturninus, his infamous associates. The triumvirate of Cæsar, Pompey, and Crassus, had this failure as a beacon-light before it ; and, therefore, avoided the rock upon which Marius had struck. Yet, when they had thus far succeeded, what was there to bind together men so devoid of real principle, so opposite in character and views of policy, and so entirely bent, each in his own way, upon his own aggrandizement ? It was evident that disunion would soon appear ; and that a struggle, perhaps

a civil war, would almost certainly be the result. So, indeed, it happened; but, at present, each was too much engrossed with his own immediate object to trouble himself about ulterior views. Crassus thirsted still for gold; and in the pursuit of his darling vice was slain, and had the molten gold, it is said, poured down his throat in bitter mockery. Pompey wished to enjoy at Rome the fame which he had won in his wars against Mithridates, and his allies; and to enjoy, it would seem, his peculiar privilege of displaying himself at the public games in his triumphal robes. Cæsar longed for power; to be the first man, perhaps the king, of Rome. But a little while previously, when on his way to Spain, some one remarked to him, that even in the country through which they were passing, there seemed to be factions and struggles for power. Cæsar's answer betrayed his inmost soul: "Yes," he said, "and, for my part, I would rather be the first man here, than the second at Rome."

This reply, which Merivale has omitted to notice, completes the evidence furnished by Cæsar's own actions: his great object was to rule, to "be the first man" wherever he was. For this he had courted popularity when he brought before the eyes of the people the bust and the trophies of Marius. For this, in defiance of the law, he had, when *Ædile* and assistant to the *Prætor*, prosecuted the executioners employed in Sylla's proscriptions. For this it was, no less than for his own infamous pleasures, that he had contracted debts to such an enormous amount, that, as he himself is said to have declared, the gift of more than £1,000,000 sterling, would leave him still without a farthing. For this power he had braved the hostility of most of the senators. For this he had persuaded Pompey and Crassus to forget their enmity, and join with him against the senate. For this he was, on the one hand, passing agrarian laws to gratify many thousands of the people with portions of land at Capua, and other parts of Italy; while on the other, having obtained the government of Gaul for five years, and having thus a prospect of returning with fame, wealth, and a veteran army, he cared little that his union with Pompey and Crassus was now perceived by all, and that, instead of being received with the usual cheers, he was now every where ironically greeted with the official title of *triumvir*: he looked into the future, and saw how easily the spectacle of a triumph, the passing

of fresh agrarian laws, a few banquets for the populace, and an open, frank, and generous bearing, would turn their irony into enthusiastic shouts. For these means of becoming the ruler of Rome, he looked to Gaul.

This country possessed no attraction for either Crassus or Pompey. Heedless of Sylla's warning to "beware of the young trifier," they secured for him four legions, and the command of Gaul for five years, and exulted that the richest provinces, those of the east and south, were exclusively theirs.

Cæsar's operations in his new province seem to require some explanation of the state of the Gaulish population. To this task, accordingly, Mr. Merivale now addresses himself: but not with that full, pregnant, brevity with which alone such subjects should be handled. The fondness of the Gaulish chiefs for display, as shewn in their armlets, bracelets, collars, and sometimes breastplates, of solid gold, and in garments dyed of various colours, and strewn with flowers, and variegated with gold: their numerous clans of men little better, as Cæsar remarks, than slaves, and having no share in the government, indeed scarcely a will of their own; their boastful exultation in the hour of triumph, their depression in adversity; their return from battle singing their hymn of victory, with spoils reeking with blood borne before them, and with the heads of their enemies dangling at their bridles and soon to be set up on poles before the gates of the town, or the entrance to their own houses; their round built houses made of planks and hurdles and high-pitched roofs; their traffic in British tin, their exports of bacon and military cloaks into Italy; these and other similar particulars that give a real insight into the life of the Gauls are almost all omitted.

Even the account of the Druids is incomplete: nothing is said of the apparently different, yet really similar, accounts of Cæsar on the one hand, and Strabo and Diodorus Siculus on the other; nothing of the immunities of the Druids as a distinct and numerous class. With regard to their influence in all matters of every-day life, an insinuation is loosely made that "the councils and institutions of the Gallic nations were more independent of Druidical influence," but that it "exerted a vigorous ascendancy over the lower classes," (p. 261) and remote localities, though Cæsar expressly states that the Druids

were the national lawgivers and arbiters, and that all men without exception, whether in a private or public station, were compelled to obey their decisions, and that they no less than the nobles ("equites") existed in every part of Gaul. Even when Mr. Merivale speaks of their holding "the great religious assembly of the whole of Gaul," the expression is vague, and strictly speaking erroneous: it was an assembly for legal, no less than for purely religious, purposes. The following is Cæsar's statement: "At a certain time of the year, these (Druids) take up their abode in a consecrated spot on the borders of the Carnuti. To this place those that are at variance resort from every part of the country, and submit to their judgments and decisions." (vi. 13.)

Other inaccuracies with regard to Gaulish manners and customs are not unfrequent: Mr. Merivale declares, for instance, that "by the side of this Oriental theism there existed another system, much less distinctive in its character, an elemental worship of the grossest kind, in which the objects of nature were identified with the memory of deceased heroes, and the sun and the stars, the thunder and the whirlwind, were worshipped as the visible representatives of superior beings. The Roman sceptic was surprised to find the barbarians adoring, as he said, the same dignities whom his own critical acuteness had rejected." (p. 260.)

The authorities quoted for this passage are Cæsar and the poet Lucan. The latter, in a grave enquiry of this nature, we might dispense with; yet neither he nor Cæsar speak of the sun and stars as being worshipped "as the visible representatives of superior beings. Nor in the passages referred to, do these writers mention, as an unguarded reader might suppose, that they had discovered the folly of the Roman Mythology.

Another inaccuracy of a similar character is the description of "the Gauls crouching in abject terror before an enemy (the Germans,) whom they dared not encounter." It has, of late, been much the fashion in the literary world, to disparage every other race, in order to extol the Germans. That the Gauls might have crouched for a time after a signal defeat and great slaughter, is no wonder, has happened frequently to the German races; but to say that they dared not encounter them, is an assertion very far from the truth. Even when the German chief

Ariovistus, and two of the more powerful of the Gallic tribes had united against the *Ædui*, the latter immediately took the field, and, though defeated, ceased not the conflict until the cavalry, the flower of their armies, and their chiefs of every class, had been almost totally cut off. The *Helvetians* were a Gallic tribe, and so far from crouching with fear before the Germans, they made frequent incursions into their territories. The *Belgæ* were, probably, Gauls, or Celts, as Mr. Merivale himself maintains, and they, too, were incessantly at war with their neighbours, the Germans. Indeed, had they not been of quite a warlike character, most remote from fear, how could Tacitus state, on the authority of *Cæsar*, that they were once mightier than the Germans, and wrested settlements from them, and add, in his *Life of Agricola*, that their valour lasted as long as their liberty;* until they were crushed by the genius of *Cæsar*, and the discipline of the Roman legions.

There are some deficiencies in this sketch of Gaulish life, still more to be regretted than even these inaccuracies; and amongst the rest, the total omission of a description of the state of the lower orders. It is too true indeed, that our insight into their neglected lot is very obscure, yet for this very reason, an historian, with regard to such a point, should be unusually diligent.

Barbarian life is sometimes depicted as a state of noble simplicity and enviable freedom. Such descriptions, however, are only the dreams of self-styled philosophers: history, genuine history tells a very different tale. The debtors of Rome, and the debtors clothed in skins that tended their chieftain's herds in some Gaulish forest, had a similar fate; vexations incredible, ending too frequently in a perpetual slavery. To turn from the numerous class of debtors to one still larger; to turn to the poor and maimed, the aged and sick, where for these were the places of shelter? No voice whispered in their ears the comfort of a future world, though there was a dreamy idea of such a state; no fund had been bequeathed, no hospital reared, for the wants of the body. If a chieftain chose to reckon his able-bodied men as he reckoned his cattle, and to give them the same kind of aid, what was there to induce him to do the same for those that could make him no return? If

* "*Amissa virtute pariter ac libertate.*"

an only son's feelings towards his helpless parents shone forth above the darkness and paganism of his soul, and he were slain, where was now their hope? If, as often happened, the whole nation migrated, what was the fate of the many helpless ones? If the tribe were unusually tender-hearted, and neither left them behind nor suffered them to toil along on foot, what if the tribe were defeated, and defeated by men that had not the occasional clemency of Cæsar? Who were to succour them in the often-recurring seasons of famine and pestilence? In short, who shall unroll

“The short and simple annals of the poor?”

They have too generally been beneath the notice of the historian; but enough has been accidentally recorded in all ages and nations, to shew beneath the meteor-blaze of accumulated wealth and successful war, a boundless swamp of vice and misery. Thus has it ever been, thus will it ever be. Poverty and crime may be mitigated, as by the gigantic exertions of the middle ages; but poverty and crime there will always be. Man will always bear upon his face the stamp of his fallen condition; and the political empiricks that would deny the wretchedness of savage life, or, still more, that would complete the work of the Reformation, by uprooting the surviving institutions of charity, and by endeavouring to substitute socialism in place of religion, are only rendering that stamp more hideous; are wasting property and life in an untried speculation, which, as history and human nature itself alike proclaim, must, if put to the proof, terminate in defeat and confusion.

The very wretchedness of the poor makes them fond of change: they may gain, they can scarcely lose. Whether from this feeling, or from a mixture of many feelings, novelty, obedience, and martial ardour, the Gauls for many centuries before the time of Cæsar, had been almost constantly in motion, and by every movement had, again and again, agitated all the civilized nations of Europe. Braver than even the Germans, as the same great general tells us, and exceedingly numerous, they swarmed in great masses from their native fields, and, for a time, seemed about to execute that overthrow of old empires and institutions, which was reserved for the Germans and Huns, five hundred years later. Etruria, whose cities were singly almost a match for Rome, was laid prostrate, not more by

blows from the South, than by blows from the Gallic warriors of the North. Rome shared the fate of Etruria, and Italy that of Rome. The Romans, however, were as yet poor and hardy, and though trembling at the remembrance of the slaughter of the Allia, they dared to face their terrible invaders, and recovered heart from repeated victories.

Finding that they paid dearly for every inroad, the Gauls now moved towards the east. The valley of the Danube, Illyricum, even Delphi, saw the flash of their broad swords, while Thrace, with its numerous Greek colonies, and Asia Minor with the Greek cities that had so often defied the might of Persia, all became their prey. Nor did they forget their ancient hostility to Rome. As long as the unyielding Samnites could make good their mountain fastnesses, the Gauls were their brothers in the ranks of war. When Italy, from the Rubicon to the gulph of Tarentum, had sunk at the feet of Rome, the Gauls lent all the terrors of their name to the standards of Carthage. When Carthage, after a struggle of a century and a half, had sunk to ashes, the Gauls added their thousands to the ranks of the Cimbri and Teutones; and Rome, as it heard again and again of the slaughter of its armies, and the death of prætors and consuls, trembled at the vivid remembrance of past dangers; of the Allia, of the beleaguered capitol, and of Brennus, and his ferocious warriors. Even when Marius had stood in their path, and Cimbri, Teutones, and Gauls, lay in one red mass upon the plains of Aix and Vercellæ, the love of adventure and war ceased not to beat in the hearts of the surviving Gauls. Fifty years had not elapsed before the Helvetians, (the most numerous of the Gallic tribes that had joined the Cimbri and Teutones,) were again looking round for some new field for their restless valour. The news of their design ran through the Roman assemblies like an electric shock; but it was not confirmed, and the re-awakened dread of the Gauls served for no other purpose than, perhaps, to aid Cæsar in acquiring the coveted command of the Gaulish province. When his wish was now fully gratified, and he was yet lingering in the suburbs of Rome, news arrived that caused him to hurry at once to Geneva. The Helvetii, whose territories were on the opposite side of the lake, were all in motion. The smoke that rose from all their villages and towns, in valley, glen, and mountain, told plainly that they had given their own dwellings to the flames, and had begun.

at last their long-rumoured emigration. Soon they were seen thronging in thousands, men, women, and children, with hundreds of loaded waggons, to the right bank of the Rhone, just where its waters rush deep and broad from the ample lake. The whole nation had resolved to abandon the graves of their fathers for new settlements. Well might the Allobroges, the inhabitants of the left bank of the Rhone; well might the Romans that garrisoned Geneva, and guarded the only bridge across the river, ask with wonder and alarm, why the Helvetii had thus determined to abandon their homes. Was it the want of food? So, perhaps, they surmised: so, certainly, Mr. Merivale thinks, relying upon the authority of Dion Cassius and Cæsar. "The population," he says, "outgrew the scanty means of support, afforded by its mountain valleys." It would have been more correct, perhaps, to have said that the population had some fear for the future, but was chiefly impelled by the love of conquest. For, as Cæsar informs us, their warlike tempers could not brook the confinement of mountains and rivers: daring as they were, and thirsting for war, they were so pent within their natural barriers, that they could scarcely rove at all in quest of booty. On the west, the heights of Mount Jura; on the east, the central Alps walled them in. They could only sally forth either upon the Germans to the north, and then the passage of the Rhine was a dangerous obstacle, whether for advance or retreat, or upon their kinsmen, the Gauls, to the south, and this on one point only. "Hence it was," says Cæsar, "that they could wander with less freedom, and carry war less easily into the adjoining territories. For this reason, being men that longed for war, they were greatly afflicted. They thought that their confines, extending 240 (Roman) miles in length, and 180 in breadth, were narrow, in regard to the multitude of their people, and in regard to the glory of war and bravery." (i. 2.) The assertion that their means of support were "scanty," can scarcely be reconciled with the well-known fertility of the Swiss valleys; certainly not with Cæsar's plain statement, that he feared that the southern Germans might be tempted, by the "fertility of the soil," to take possession of the deserted country (i. 28.); nor with the address of the Gaulish chiefs to Cæsar, in which they declare that the Helvetians left their homes merely through lust of conquest, and while their affairs were in a most flourishing condition, (*florentissimis rebus*

i. 30.) As Dion Cassius lived more than two centuries and a half after the emigration of the Helvetians, his testimony cannot, for a moment, be compared with that of Cæsar and the Gaulish chiefs. Indeed, the very passage in which he mentions the emigration, contains some grave inaccuracies. He speaks of the dead Orgetorix as still living, and being the leader of the Helvetians, after they had burned their towns and begun their march; and he states that they intended to seek a new country "near the Alps," instead of which, their object was to leave the Alps, and establish themselves at such a distance, that the rocks and torrents might no longer impede their predatory incursions. It is plain, then, that we must be satisfied with the contemporary, and, indeed, sterling authority of Cæsar: The Helvetians thought that their territories would become too narrow for their numbers, and found them already too narrow for their love of peril and booty. With these very substantial reasons for disturbing their neighbours, and hazarding their own existence as a nation, they determined to move into the more open parts of Gaul. Such was the cause of their great gathering upon the banks of the Rhone.

The nature of the difficulties that lay before them may be estimated from that of their march along the river. Mr. Merivale's description of this difficulty is one of the most favourable specimens of his style, and of his manner of handling his subject.

"Two routes might conduct them westward into Gaul; the one following the defile of the Rhone, along the north bank of that river, and thus penetrating into the country of the Sequani, and the other lying to the south, and crossing the territory of the Allobroges in the direction of the province. The former of these roads was one of the utmost difficulty from the nature of the country.* For many miles the mountains descend almost perpendicularly into the torrent below. Modern engineers have succeeded in making a road along the brow of these cliffs; but the ease with which the traveller now winds round their projecting precipices, and

* Compare Cæsar's own words: "There were only two ways by which they could issue from their own country; one lay through the territory of the Sequani, a narrow and rugged (road) between Mount Jura and the river Rhone. Along this, scarcely one waggon could pass at a time, while a very high mountain hung over it, so that a very few men could keep (an advancing force) at bay." (i. 6.)

above the most tremendous abysses, serves to enhance his conception of the perils which must have attended a march among them before these obstacles were overcome. The emigrants soon decided that this route was impracticable in the face of an enemy. The other alternative offered a passage, the difficulties of which might not be insurmountable. The Rhone might be crossed, either by the bridge, which already existed at Geneva, the frontier town of the Allobroges, in possession at this period of a Roman garrison, or, if this was closed against them, the stream presented fords which might be used by bold men, accustomed to stem the torrents of the mountains. The Helvetians determined to force their way through the country of the Allobroges, and to trust either to arms or persuasion to obtain a passage through the province and across the Rhone, into the centre of Gaul." (p. 283.)

It mattered little to such men as the Helvetians that the Roman eagles were before them. Those eagles they had once before confronted, and had plucked down from their pride of place. The consul Cassius had felt their strength, and who was the obscure pro-consul, Cæsar? They soon discovered. Cæsar's first act was to destroy the bridge over the Rhone. His second, while the disconcerted Helvetians were awaiting his permission to march through the province, was to raise along the side of the Rhone, from the lake of Geneva to the gorge of Mount Jura, a strong fortification, made yet stronger by towers, and a fosse, and suitable garrisons.

"The Helvetii were not discouraged by this refusal. They made some hasty preparations, and resolved to force the passage of the river. The fords in so impetuous a stream were extremely difficult and dangerous; nevertheless, they made several attempts to cross, both by day and night; sometimes by plunging into the river, sometimes with armaments of boats and rafts. But the rampart, running close along the edge of the stream, was defended with military skill; every attempt to gain a footing on the left bank was defeated, and the assailants were compelled ultimately to abandon all hope of making good their exit in this direction."

To this passage the following note is appended

"Polyænus has collected, in his *Strategematon*, numerous stories respecting Cæsar's manœuvres, which are contradicted by the simple narrative of Cæsar himself. On this occasion he pretends, that the Roman general allowed a great part of the Helvetians to cross the river, and then attacked and destroyed them while they were reposing from their fatigues. Cæsar could not

have failed to mention this if it had been the fact ; but it is moreover, inconsistent with his account of the defences he threw up. The stories told by Polyænus are generally unworthy of credit." —p. 288, vol. i.

Mr. Merivale's remark upon Polyænus's merits, is perhaps, on the whole, correct ; but surely the inaccuracy alluded to is rather in his own narrative than in that of Polyænus. For Cæsar does not state that the "rampart" (? "murum," not "vallum,") "ran close along the edge of the stream." Indeed, with a "fosse" before it, which Cæsar expressly mentions, it was impossible that it should ; there must have been some, perhaps a considerable, interval between the wall and the river. The supposition that, in some places, at least, there was a considerable distance, is strengthened by the fact, that Romans almost invariably made their military works in straight lines, while, on the other hand, the river winds as it rushes towards the Jura ; and it is again strengthened by the words in which Cæsar briefly narrates the defence. He speaks of that defence being made not only by the fortification, and by missile-weapons, but by the charge, which here can only mean the sallying out of the soldiers, ("et militum concursu.") So far then Polyænus is correct, and Mr. Merivale strangely mistaken.

Defeated in their attempt to force the passage of the Rhone, they induced the Sequani, who held the right bank, to give them a free passage. Gaulish suppliants for aid were soon at Cæsar's feet, narrating, in terms of horror, the cruel ravages of the Helvetians. Cæsar had not forgotten his reasons for coveting the pro-consulship of Gaul. His purpose was now almost within his reach. With an enemy consisting of nearly 200,000 fighting men, he could increase his army without provoking suspicion or jealousy ; and with this increasing army improving every day in discipline and hardihood, it would be his own fault if ample spoils were wanting. Great must have been the exultation of such a man at the prospect of a war in the very centre of Gaul ; and greater yet to find that he could come forward as the champion of all the Celts that were either suffering from the ravages of the invaders, or were in any ways allied to Rome.

The Helvetians were now in the valley of the Saône, and three-fourths of their warriors had slowly crossed the

river, when Cæsar swooped upon the remaining fourth,—the very canton that had formerly defeated and slain the consul, Cassius,—and at once furious for revenge, he trampled them under foot, or scattered them into the neighbouring woods.

The Helvetians on the opposite bank had accomplished the passage of the river in twenty days. In one day, Cæsar had built a bridge and crossed with his entire army. The Helvetians, dismayed, yet boastful, like all the Gaulish tribes, still menaced their pursuer with the fate of Cassius. It was not, however a Cassius that was watching their march; and this they soon experienced to their cost. Mistaking some movements of the Romans for a retreat, the Helvetians turned, and forming into one dense phalanx, gave battle. The conflict raged from "the seventh hour," or one o'clock in the day to night-fall; and not "through *the whole* of the long summer's day," as Mr. Merivale supposes. Even after dark it continued around the waggons, till the night was far advanced. From the deeper shade of the cars and wheels, and from the vantage-ground of the waggon-tops, a thousand wounds were showered upon the Romans. During the whole battle, as Cæsar testifies, not a man of the enemy had turned his back, but now the very women and children were armed, and mingling in the desperate strife. It was the last effort of despair. Disciplined valour prevailed; and the survivors were glad to save their lives by surrendering their arms, and returning to their own deserted valleys. Cæsar's triumph was the greater, because the Helvetians were esteemed the bravest of all the Gauls.

Scarcely had the confusion of this campaign subsided, when Cæsar's attention was called to Ariovistus, a German chief, now located on the left bank of the Rhine. Called to the aid of the Sequani, in their wars with the Ædui, he acted the part of Hengist and Horsa in Kent. He took possession of one-third of the district, and reduced the rest to abject submission. Then, summoning around him fresh bands of his countrymen, he feared not to tell Cæsar, the champion of the vanquished Gauls, to attend to his own concerns, for that the Germans had as much right to their province in Gaul as the Romans had to theirs. When put to the proof, however, Ariovistus found himself as little able as the Helvetians were, to withstand the skill and discipline of the Romans. He fled across the Rhine with

scarcely a fragment of his army. Henceforth Cæsar, terrible as repeated victories had rendered him, encountered war after war, until his desire for wealth and a veteran army must have been fully sated. The Gauls justly began to regard him as an enemy. They could not understand why he, any more than Ariovistus, should remain in winter quarters amongst them, unless he had an equally hostile purpose.

In the campaign that followed, Cæsar found greater peril than in either of his previous wars. One Gaulish tribe, however, was still too ready to serve against another, and Roman discipline, thus befriended, again and again triumphed. For a time, indeed, Cæsar's fortune seemed to forsake him, and the energy of Vercingetorix, a chief of central Gaul, seemed able to expel the invader. The description of this struggle is given with much spirit, and, on the whole, is one of Mr. Merivale's best written passages.

We need not follow Cæsar to Pharsalia, nor into the Senate-house, to the scene at the foot of Pompey's statue. Enough has been said to show the character of the work before us. One further remark, which we hope to develope more completely on a future occasion, and we have done.

Mr. Merivale seems to have adopted the idea, that nations are always in a state of progress. Poor Cicero, statesman as he was, was very foolish to think that his country was retrograding,—to have no “reliance on the progressive improvement of mankind.” Cæsar “closed his eyes to the future, and shrank from even guessing at the end,” (ii. p. 539,) that end being “a career of tranquil expansion and comprehensive culture!” This is a bold assertion. Where are we to look for this “tranquil expansion?” In the days of the Second Triumvirate, and on the field of Philippi, and during the tearing away of lands from their rightful owners to bestow them upon successful veterans? Or, when Cicero, and, indeed, every one that was suspected of loving law and liberty, was ruthlessly butchered? Or, was it seated with complacent smiles on the Promontory of Actium? Perhaps, however, Augustus's reign was the golden age, not of literature only, but of liberty, and national and individual happiness. If so, what became of the theory after Augustus? Was Tacitus as simple as Cicero and Cæsar, when he wept for the days of the republic? Did men, notwithstanding his lamenta-

tions, still progress? In what? In literature? Assuredly not. In liberty? Let Tiberius, Nero, Domitian, Commodus, and Carraccalla, give answer. Let the groans of the municipal decurions, ground to the dust with taxes, give answer. Let the days of what are called the Thirty Tyrants, with their thirty conflicting armies, and the hordes of Germans rioting unscathed in the spoils of Gaul, Spain, and Africa, let these give answer. Was it when the flames of the Goths were kindled among the halls of Rome, or when the Heruli and Vandals had joined in the pillage? Or when Belisarius rode up the capitol, and saw at his feet only a vast marble solitude,

"The Niobe of nations
Childless and crownless in her voiceless woe?"

Or when the whole empire was disunited, and given for centuries to the barbarians, and to their almost incessant wars, with all the attendants of such wars, the famines and pestilences that desolated Europe, no less than did the Goth, and Vandal, and Hun, and Dane, and Saracen? If Cicero could have looked into their ages, would he not have found enough to justify his want of reliance on the progressive improvement of mankind? Would not Cæsar have shrunk more than ever "from even guessing at the end?"

"But the Roman statesmen and philosophers, with their strong practical instincts, took no comprehensive survey of the destinies of their race." (vol. 2, p. 538.) No: they knew too much of history and human nature to indulge in any such dream, however comprehensive. They were too "practical" for a theory which threatens to degrade the followers of the Guizot school of history to the level of mere political enthusiasts.

On the whole, then, we must acknowledge, that we are disappointed with these volumes. If, indeed, they are really but an introduction to the History of the Roman Empire, we must suspend our censure; but, if, as the preface seems to intimate, circumstances have prevented "the further prosecution" of the work, then, indeed, is our disappointment complete. For our own part, we have waited several months in hopes of seeing the third volume coming forward, as a promise for the rest; in hopes of seeing an English writer occupying ground which is really a dreary

waste in our literature. With regard to the period included in the two volumes before us, we do not see that Ferguson, a writer of fifty years' standing, has been surpassed, or, in general, even equalled by Mr. Merivale.

This is an age of shew and splendid promise. We trust that in Mr. Merivale's case the promise will be speedily redeemed. As it is, at present, the title is anything but suitable. The history of the Roman Empire, a history very much wanted, is announced; and as the reader proceeds, he finds that it is nothing more than a history of the Life and Times of Julius Cæsar.

“Amphora cœpit
Institui, currente rotâ, cur urceus exit?”

ART. VI.—(1.) *Sacred and Legendary Art.* By MRS. JAMESON.
Second edition, royal 8vo. London, Longmans, 1850.

(2.) *Legends of the Monastic Orders, as represented in the Fine Arts.*
Forming the second series of *Sacred and Legendary Art.* By
MRS. JAMESON, Royal 8vo. London: Longmans, 1850.

WE had believed that the days of Iconoclasm were long past and forgotten. It enjoyed, at its origin, a longer period of ascendancy, and under more powerful auspices, than almost any other form of religious mania that the world has ever seen. All that force, fraud, corruption and fanaticism, could devise, was pressed into its service for nearly half a century. At one period it would seem as if its triumph was complete and final. Nearly all the bishops of the Byzantine empire had bowed their neck to its yoke, and a powerful fleet was despatched to compel the submission of the opposite shore of the Mediterranean. But the attempt upon the West failed signally. Eventually, indeed, it led to the disruption of the fairest provinces of the degenerate empire: and even in the East, when the iron yoke of the odious tyrants who ruled from Leo the Isaurian to Irene, was withdrawn, truth and reason speedily vindicated their rights, and the eastern provinces

returned with enthusiasm, and even, as it seemed to their colder brethren of the West, with excess, to the cherished usage which had been so long and so cruelly proscribed.

Since that time the mania has occasionally re-appeared, but at distant and irregular intervals. The disciples of Pierre de Bruis, the Henricians, and the Hussites, are too distant from each other, and too dissimilar in principles, to be regarded even as straggling links of a chain connecting the iconoclasts of the seventeenth century with those of the seventh; nor can we find anywhere in history the genuine descendants of the followers of the two Leos, and Constantine Copronymus, except in the school of Geneva, especially in its earlier and more fanatical period.

Even this school, however, seemed to have modified its principles. There are few of its modern disciples who do not look back with regret, and even with shame, upon the blind fanaticism of its founders; and, although, in theory, the worship of images is regarded by them with the same feelings of abhorrence which, in their forefathers, led to the destruction of many of the noblest monuments of Christian art, yet in practice, the use of sacred art for the purposes of instruction and edification has long been freely tolerated, and even liberally encouraged. Indeed, the impulse which Christian art has received in England during the last fifteen years, is one of the most remarkable characteristics of the age; and although those who have been foremost in communicating this impulse have been far from appreciating its true import, or anticipating its necessary results, the work which they have done has lost none of its intrinsic efficacy, from the limited or modified motives of its authors.

With the knowledge of these facts, therefore, the lovers of Christian art will have been but ill prepared for the formidable intelligence recently communicated to the public by a gentleman who, some months back, obtained a very unenviable notoriety by a correspondence of which it is impossible to speak without shame. The days of Iconoclasm, as we learn from certain late revelations of this gentleman, are *not* past. A new Isaurian has arisen. War has been declared anew against the debasement of the spirituality of religion by the devices of man's imitative art; and if the Church be not stirred once again from her foundations and aroused to holy enthusiasm in the cause of Iconomachy, it certainly will not

be the fault of its modern apostle. He spares no trouble and no expense in the sacred contest. With all the zeal of the olden image-breakers, we do not read of any of them who went to so generous lengths, or encountered so tremendous sacrifices, as Mr. George Rochfort Clarke informs us he has made. Although we have made the history of iconoclasm a very particular study, we can find no parallel for the enthusiasm of this devoted gentleman. We believe we are right in stating that the Isaurian, and the Armenian, and Copronymus and Theophilus, generally speaking, contented themselves with destroying other people's images, and especially those which they found in the churches and convents of the poor defenceless monks. But Mr. Rochfort Clarke, with far more of self-sacrificing zeal, directs his first indignation against his own. We believe, too, that the image-breakers of old destroyed the images wheresoever they found them, nor are we aware that they ever went through the ceremony of purchasing images in order to destroy them. But Mr. Rochfort Clarke carries his zeal to a much more refined length. He scorns to be virtuous at so cheap a rate. He buys his images for the purpose of destroying them at his own cost; and on learning that an eminent London firm had engraved a plate of Murillo's picture of "The Trinity," preserved in the National Gallery, he actually paid down out of his own pocket, *no less a sum than* "two guineas," for a copy of the print; brought it to a full meeting of members of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge; and regardless of expense, tore it to pieces before their eyes.* Whether he did so with the full approbation of the assembly, is a subject of controversy between him and a member of the society who was present at the meeting;† but the issue does not in any way affect the zeal, the generosity, or the self-sacrificing devotedness of Mr. Rochfort Clarke.

Nor is this one solitary act of this generous and enthusiastic gentleman. He informs us that it is the result of "twenty years' reflection and experience;" and is but a repetition on a small scale of a wholesale act of destruction

* See his letter, May 12, 1851, in the *Record Newspaper* of that date. Also in the *Morning Chronicle*, May 14.

† See a letter in the *Morning Chronicle*, May 23.

which he performed no less than twenty years ago. On one fatal day, twenty years since, Mr. Rochfort Clarke "went through" all his prints; nor did he spare, inexorable man, a single one, "however well done or costly," which was at variance with his notions. He describes the result in very glowing language. "The mythology of Rome, whether Papal or Pagan, received no mercy at his hands. Mary and Venus," he blasphemously adds, "fell together, and Jupiter and Peter vanished in the same smoke." Fortunately for the sculptor's art, he was not possessed of any specimens. They too would have been ruthlessly immolated. "However well done or costly," they would "doubtless have paved the roads."* This is now full twenty years since. We are not aware, that any very fatal consequences have since resulted to Christian art; but this certainly is not the fault of Mr. Rochfort Clarke.

At all events, now that we learn upon such authority that the enemies of Christian art have again taken the field, it behoves all its friends to exert themselves with double energy. And we trust that our readers will forgive our alluding to so ludicrous a revelation, when we use it as an occasion of bringing under their notice Mrs. Jameson's beautiful volume upon *Sacred and Legendary Art*, and the sequel to it, recently published under the title of *Legends of the Monastic Orders*. We can hardly account indeed, for the delay of our notice of the former of these two works; but perhaps it has had some advantage, in enabling us, by considering them both together, to place at once before the reader's mind the entire subject of legendary art in all its developments. Of the details of so extensive and so varied a compilation, it would plainly be idle to attempt to give an adequate idea; and much of what we shall have to say of its general bearings, applies to the "*Legends of the Monastic Orders*," equally with the "*Legendary Art*."

As a spirited and tasteful testimony against the principles of Iconoclasm, and its modern descendant, Puritanism in art, and as an elegant exposition of some of its principles as applied to sacred subjects, Mrs. Jameson's publication would at any time be welcome; and although we are loath to

* See his letter of May 12.

persuade ourselves that there is any special tendency in the temper of the present time, yet there have been some indications of a certain sympathy even with the wild fanaticism of such reformers as Mr. Clarke, which make it now more than ordinarily acceptable.

Still we can hardly bring ourselves to believe that there is any portion of the thinking community who can seriously require instruction or arguments upon a subject on which instinct and reason themselves supply the most satisfactory evidence. We are not now referring to the purely theological question of honouring sacred images or exhibiting reverence to them. Our observations apply exclusively to that use of them which is analogous to the use of pious reading, of pious conversation, of sermons or public lectures, and of the holy Scriptures themselves; namely, as incentives to devotion, and as safeguards against distraction and wandering of the mind. It is not merely as a means of instruction for the unlearned, for whom, to use the phrase of one of the most profound of thinkers, Leibnitz, the productions of sacred art may stand in the place of an alphabet. There is hardly any one who may not with advantage avail himself of its assistance. From the very nature of the operations of the mind, it is impossible that it should be otherwise. We cannot fix our thoughts upon any idea without forming to ourselves a sensible image of it; and upon the vividness and permanency of this image, the vigour and activity of the mental operations mainly depend. It is scarcely necessary to add that in the formation, and still more in the maintenance, of these mental images, the use of suitable representations, whether of the simple idea, or of the complicated subject which it is desired to bring before the mind, cannot fail to be eminently advantageous. In truth, in placing before the eye, by the aid of art, such a representation, though it addresses the mind through a different medium, we, in reality, employ the very same substantial device, as when we assist or stimulate the understanding by a written appeal or a spoken exhortation. In both operations alike, the mind is addressed through the medium of sense. In both alike, the end directly sought is the same;—the creation of a certain series of mental imagery. And whatever has been said of the difficulty of preventing the mind of the uninstructed from resting ultimately upon the image produced by such sensible representa-

tions as pictures, statuary, or other works of art, there can be no doubt that, in themselves, they do not tend a whit more to sensualize or materialise the operation of the mind, than the other aids of thought which may be employed, and which, though they appeal to a different faculty, are nevertheless all intended to produce the very same ultimate effect. A name is a representative of an idea, quite as much as a picture. A written or printed description of a scene, or a verbal narrative of an event, is as much a picture to the reader's or hearer's mind as though it had come from the painter's hand. The effect upon his imagination is precisely the same. The words of the writer tend just as directly, although in a different way, to produce the images of the various persons and things which he describes, as do the touches of the painter's pencil. Indeed, if any confirmation of the identity of the two mental operations were required, it would be found in the fact, that the writings of most primitive nations is but an adaptation of the pictorial art.

Hence the very constitution of the human mind, as it exists in this body of sense, appears to suggest the natural propriety, if not in some sense necessity, of the use of art as the companion and assistant of its operations. Dependent upon the external senses for every impression which it receives, and habituated by this very dependence to contemplate the objects of its thoughts solely under the sensible images of these objects which the senses present, its very first step in the process of thought is the formation within itself of a sensible image of the subject or thing which it proposes to consider. Nor is it possible for it to proceed in its very loftiest and most spiritualized conceptions, nor even in the contemplation of the most abstract ideas, and those seemingly farthest withdrawn from the sphere of sense, except by this process or some modification of this process. The highest and holiest of the saints, in his most sublime meditation upon the passion of our Lord, will find his mind, by a process over which he has no control, filled, in the very act of thought, with images of the various scenes in the sad history which he is considering; and in proportion to the vividness and distinctness of these images, is the fervour and truth of his meditation. His mental act is precisely the same in kind, though infinitely higher in degree, as that of the rude and uninstructed peasant, whose mind tries to follow with laborious piety

the representation of those scenes depicted in the series of stations of the cross, or to dwell upon the consummation of them all, of which his crucifix is to him the memorial and the type. So again the idea of the incarnation naturally calls up, or indeed, to speak more accurately, presupposes, the image of the infant God in the arms of His Virgin-mother. There is no other form under which the mind is physically capable of entertaining it. The history of the saints and martyrs as it exists in the mind, is but the memory of the mental pictures under which they have been presented to us. And it is so with the acts of adoration, of love, or of veneration, which are founded upon these ideas. If the soul be excited to love and gratitude towards the Saviour who redeemed it, the act by which these sentiments are elicited is mechanically directed to that sensible image of our Lord upon the cross, under which alone it is able to contemplate Him. The act of adoration of the God-Incarnate, has for its object not an abstract ideality, but the Divinity with the form which sense has conveyed. A saint is honoured or invoked not as a name or a vague generality, but in the form of some distinct and determinate image, under which, perhaps, without the smallest foundation in point of fact, the mind, from the very necessity induced by this habitual dependence upon the impressions of sense, has figured him to itself. In a word, from the very physical constitution of the mind, all its aspirations, even of the most abstract kind, are directly referred to these mental images; and all its acts of adoration, are, and must be, in a certain sense of the words, acts of mental image-worship.

The reasoning here employed must be admitted by all who admit any form of external religion. No one who recognises the utility of sermons, lectures, nay of the reading of Holy Scripture itself, can evade its application. It would be idle to apply it exclusively to those acts which are founded upon the impressions received from the imagery presented by pictures or similar works of art. The same is true, and must be true, of the impressions received from the images produced by words, signs, or any other sensible representations of ideas. It is well observed by the acute writer already referred to, that "names, too, are signs, although far inferior to images for significancy."* And

* Leibnitz's *System of Theology*, p. 63. (English translation.)

he argues that, inasmuch as the object of reading or hearing a history, is simply to obtain in the mind a representation of the scenes or events which it records, and as this object is equally, and indeed more effectively, obtained by painted or graven representations of these scenes, and especially as the impression which such representations produce is more lasting, more vivid, and better calculated to interest the imagination and stimulate the affections, it would be a grievous perversion of one of God's noblest gifts, and an unpardonable neglect of one of the most powerful means which He has given us of appealing to the heart, to discard from the service of religion the speaking and almost living creations of the art of the painter and the sculptor.*

And further, by the same beautiful and appropriate illustration, he shows, that as the Catholic Church never sanctions in the use of images, any act of honour or of worship, which is not referred to the original represented by the image, the honours which she thus permits are identical in principle, and actually the very same in kind, with those which all christians, in accordance with the words of St. Paul, exhibit to the sacred name of Jesus. In the one case, as in the other, the honour is paid not to the external representation (which in both cases is a sensible thing: in the first a written or spoken word, in the second a painted or graven image,) but to the internal or mental image which both alike are intended to represent and to call up in the mind. †

It is painful to think that, in an age of enlightenment like ours, there should be any for whom it is necessary to write the apology of Christian art. But it is gratifying to know that the necessity is felt by others, as well as by Catholics. The popularity of Mrs. Jameson's work, is a pleasing evidence that the impulse under which it was written is not solitary and isolated. The general tone of sentiment which pervades it has found an echo in the mind of a large section of the community; and although it falls short in many important particulars, of the true Catholic spirit, yet it cannot but be regarded as a useful pioneer in the wide field of Catholic art;—destined, we may hope, not only to remove many impediments from the way, but to effect an entrance where catholics would have no chance of

* *Ibid.* p. 54.† *Ibid.* p. 64.

admission. A friendly critic, to whom the Authoress refers in terms of high respect in the preface of her second series, assured her that she had "spoiled her book by not making it Roman Catholic." We cannot help, of course, regretting with Mrs. Jameson's friend that her book is not Roman Catholic; but at least in the absence of such a work, we gratefully accept it as a useful preparative. Mrs. Jameson has frankly explained the principles which have guided her in this particular.

"To speak of the religious pictures painted for the monastic communities, and to avoid altogether any allusion to disputed points of faith, of history, of character, has been impossible. It was said of the First Series, by an authority for which I have a high respect, that I had 'spoiled my book by not making it *Roman Catholic*.' But I am not a Roman Catholic:—how, therefore, could I honestly write in the tone of thought, feeling, conviction, natural and becoming in one of that faith? I have had to tread what all will allow to be difficult and dangerous ground. How was this to be done safely, and without offence, easily given in these days? Not, surely, by swerving to the right and to the left;—not by the affectation of candour;—not by leaving wholly aside aspects of character and morals which this department of the Fine Arts, the representations of monastic life, necessarily place before us. There was only one way in which the task undertaken could be achieved in a right spirit—by going straight forward, according to the best lights I had, and saying what appeared to me the truth, as far as my subject required it: and my subject—let me repeat it here—is artistic and æsthetic, not religious. This is too much of egotism, but it has become necessary to avoid ambiguity. I will only add that, as from the beginning to the end of this book there is not one word false to my own faith—my own feeling, so I truly hope there is not one word which can give offence to the earnest and devout reader of any persuasion:—if there be, I am sorry;—what can I say more?"—*Monastic Orders*, pp. xiv., xv.

We freely admit that she has endeavoured to carry out this view honestly and sincerely, nor does her work present any indication of other than a disposition to avoid every cause of offence. But it is not in the nature of things that a work upon such a subject by any other than a Catholic pen, should be free from sentiments and expressions, which, however unintentionally and even unknowingly, must be painful to a Catholic reader. Indeed, the very plan of the work itself is one which will suggest sufficient cause of pain to a religious Catholic. The sub-

jects with which it deals are of such a character as hardly to be capable in his mind of being separated from religion, or treated with other than feelings of faith, reverence, and love. To separate them from this character, to deal simply with their poetry, their natural beauty, or their artistic propriety, is in itself to revolt in some degree the habitual tone of the Catholic mind. And although Mrs. Jameson's æstheticism is by no means of a cold and purely scientific cast, yet it falls far short of the warm and generous trustfulness in which we should desire to see such subjects discussed.

We say this, however, by no means in the spirit of complaint, nor as implying any censure upon the amiable authoress. On the contrary, we feel that with her present convictions, to have written as we should have desired to see the subject written, would have been to have violated truth, sincerity, and good faith itself. And what we say of the general tone of her volumes, and of the general views which pervade them, we would also extend to several inaccuracies in matters of fact, some of them in rather important particulars, from which they are not exempt. We willingly acquit her of any intentional mis-statement adverse to Catholic views; and while we feel how difficult it must have been for a writer obliged to receive much of her information at second hand, to avoid such inaccuracies, where her authorities were themselves strongly anti-catholic in their tone, we are bound to admit that the work itself supplies abundant evidence that such inaccuracies are the result of want of sufficient information, rather than of a desire to offend or give pain.

The portion of Mrs. Jameson's subject which is purely legendary, is one upon which no one can possibly write satisfactorily for catholics, but one who is himself a catholic. It is not alone that the principles which we apply to these subjects are different from those on which protestants are accustomed to judge. It is rather that the very mould in which the catholic mind is cast from infancy is essentially different. We are accustomed to realize more fully than even the most liberally disposed protestant can ever bring himself to do, the communion between the visible and the invisible world; and to look for, or at least to receive without incredulity, evidences of God's interposition, direct, or indirect, in the government of his church, or in the salvation, and all that regards the salvation, or

sanctification, of his chosen servants. What to our minds is familiar and habitual, to a protestant is revolting, or at least hard of belief; and this very characteristic, which to their eyes takes the appearance of credulity, and even superstition, is regarded as one of the leading peculiarities of the modern Church. That an event is supernatural, is, in the eyes of a protestant, *prima facie* evidence against its existence. To a catholic, if the circumstances be not of themselves calculated to create a doubt, the supernatural need not present more difficulty than the purely natural.

In discussing the subject of legends and legendary art, it is impossible to overlook this leading discrepancy; and the more so because it is to this that protestants most frequently point, as evidencing the corruption of the modern Roman Church, and her perversion of the primitive and scriptural simplicity of christianity. We are far from accepting the responsibility of all the so-called legends which may be found in the various local churches, whether of our own or of foreign countries. Many of them are undoubtedly false. Some, at least as they have been occasionally put forward, are even positively dishonouring to religion; and none form any part of the doctrine of the church, or in any way enter into the essential principles of catholic faith. And it may be necessary to caution the reader against receiving the version of each legend put forward by Mrs. Jameson, as the authorized, or even the popularly received, form in which the legend is, or has been, believed. Mrs. Jameson's version, generally speaking, exhibits the legend in its poetical or artistic form, and perhaps with all the fanciful and imaginary embellishments which they have received in both processes. This is especially true of the legends of the Rhine, and of Germany generally; and indeed will be easily understood to follow naturally from the plan of Mrs. Jameson's work, which is addressed altogether to the artistic, rather than the devotional or ascetic, view of the subject.

It would be wrong, however, to pass over this opportunity of offering a few observations upon this supposed characteristic of mediæval and modern Catholicism,—the tendency which it exhibits to receive, with blind and ready credulity, the most extravagant and incredible legends of the saints, even in cases where the evidences of falsehood and impossibility are palpable and conclusive. Mrs. Jame-

son looks with an indulgent eye upon this tendency in consideration of the manifold beauties and excellencies in art to which it has given birth. But we should be sorry, in accepting this compassionate indulgence, to recognize the seeming assumption upon which it is based ;—namely, that this tendency to receive, and even to look for, the supernatural, is a peculiarity of the modern Church ; that it was the fruit of the ignorance and credulity of the mediæval times ; and that it is inconsistent with the spirit of primitive christianity. Even Catholics themselves are too ready to recognize, nay, to dwell upon, this assumption ; and it is well that all misconception regarding it should be removed.

Now the truth is, that so far from being a characteristic of modern and corrupt christianity, this tendency has been discernible from the very earliest times, and has exhibited itself in forms precisely analagous to those which are commonly regarded as peculiar to modern or mediæval Catholicity.

It would be strange indeed if in those ages when the memory of our Lord's promise to His followers was still fresh ; while his assurance that " signs should follow them," was still ringing in men's ears ; while the very details of the wonders which they were to work ;—the devils they were to cast out—the new tongues in which they were to speak—the serpents they were to take up—the deadly things they were to drink unharmed—the miraculous cures they were to achieve ;—it would seem strange if an age taught to look forward to such events as these, should have been an age of incredulity. The history of St. John the Evangelist's delivery from the caldron of boiling oil has all the seeming characteristics of a mediæval legend, and is rejected as incredible, even by writers tolerably free from scepticism,* on the very same grounds upon which most of these modern legends of saints are disbelieved. Yet this circumstance, only fifty years after the event, is related by Tertullian† in terms which not only prove that he entertained no doubt of it, but that it was unhesitatingly admitted by all the christians of his time. The miracle of the Thundering Legion is of the same character. Yet it is told

* See Mosheim, i. 74. (Soames' Tr.)

† De Prescript, adv. Hereticus, cap. xxxvi.

by Apollinaris and Tertullian. It would be hard, again, to find a tale which seemingly involves more elements of what, according to popular notions, would be held to be the more incredible, than that of the collision of the Apostles, SS. Peter and Paul, with Simon Magus, his attempted flight in the air by the aid of the devil, the apostles' prayer for his humiliation, his fall, and miserable death. If such a tale were found in the life of a saint of the twelfth or fourteenth century, it would be at once declared to be the offspring of the extravagant notions of those corrupt and ignorant ages. Now the story, with all its wonderful circumstances, is related seriously in a grave argument with unbelievers by Arnobius,* who lived in the latter half of the third century. And we shall see hereafter that it was universally received in his time.

It may be alleged that in the literary remains of these ages we found but few traces of those tales. But it must not be forgotten that these remains are scanty and imperfect, and that for the most part they are of a class to which such subjects were entirely foreign. Apologies of Christianity against the charges of the pagans, confutations of Paganism and of the heresies which had their origin in Paganism, purely dogmatical treatises upon the doctrines of the Christian religion, are not the class of works in which we should expect to find even a casual notice of the miracles of the early saints, and particularly of such miracles as we are now contemplating. With all the supposed credulity of the age in which they lived and wrote, the dogmatical works of St. Thomas of Aquin, the controversial works of St. Bernard, and a large proportion even of the ascetic writings of St. Bonaventure might be read through without discovering a trace of this legendary lore which is represented as the great characteristic of their age. And if all the other literature, and all the records, of these ages were lost, we would conclude from the exclusive study of these, as is now concluded from the similar works of the early fathers, that not a word was ever heard in mediæval times, of the fabulous and extravagant tales, the origin of which is now attributed exclusively to these ages.

But, indeed, even from the records of the early christians which we do possess, we can sufficiently discover

* *Adversus Gentiles*, ii. p. 64.

the prevalence and even universality of their belief in these miraculous powers. The seventh chapter in the Fifth Book of Eusebius's History, (which is specially important, inasmuch as it alleges the authority of St. Irenæus,) shows that the powers bestowed upon the Apostles were regarded as permanently enduring in the Church; and one of the earliest and most interesting monuments of the history of Christianity in the west, the letter of the Churches of Lyons and Vienne, preserved in the same book, contains a narrative which, if we did not know its source, would present indubitable evidence of mediæval origin. There is no class of the mediæval miracles and revelations which provoke incredulity more strongly than those for which no motive sufficiently important can be assigned, the principle of judgment being the rule laid down by Horace:

Nec Deus intersit, nisi dignus vindice nodus.

By this test are judged and rejected all those miraculous facts which are of a purely private and personal nature, and do not seem to be called for by any signal or important interest of religion. Suppose it were told, for example, that a saint who had been accustomed to practise certain austerities, received a revelation from God that he should discontinue these practices; would not this revelation at once be set down, either as a delusion, or perhaps an imposture? Now the letter of the Churches referred to relates this in express terms of one of the martyrs of Gaul, Alcibiades, "who had led a hard and mortified life, abstaining from all common food, and partaking solely of bread and water. When he was cast into prison, it was revealed to Attalus, (another of the martyrs) that Alcibiades did not do well in not making use of the creatures of God." *

But the scanty notices gleaned from such casual allusions as these must afford a very inadequate idea of the real spirit of the time. In the literature of modern Catholics, it is not to the dogmatical, or controversial, or philosophical, writings, we look, for an account of the lives and miracles of the saints. Neither should we expect it in the same department of the early Christian literature. The ancients, like the moderns, devoted to these subjects a special department of their literature—the Hagiographical;

* Euseb. v. 3, p. 164.

and we do not hesitate to say, that the earliest specimens of this literature which we possess display the most perfect identity to their spirit, and in their detail, with that of the modern Church of Rome. St. Jerome's *Lives of the Oriental Saints*; Paulinus's *Life of St. Felix of Nola*; Prudentius's *Hymns*; the twenty-second book of St. Augustine's *City of God*; would be unhesitatingly classed by any ordinary Protestant reader with the credulous and silly inventions of the mediæval cloisters; and the "*Religious History*" of Theodoret, though it consists but of thirty chapters, would supply a type for almost every single class of miraculous legend that has ever been circulated in the darkest time.

Our readers may recollect some specimens of the views entertained upon these topics by Paulinus, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and Prudentius, which formed the subject of one or two former papers in this journal.* So little is known, however, of the work of Theodoret, that we are tempted to devote a page or two to a short description of its contents, as illustrative of the notions of his contemporaries on the subject of miracles and miraculous legends. It is hardly necessary to say, that the writer is the celebrated ecclesiastical historian, that he is one of our chief authorities on the Arian and Macedonian controversies; and that he was one of the most distinguished and prominent characters in all the great controversies of the Incarnation, which agitated the Church during the first half of the fifth century.

The *Philotheus*, or "*Religious History*" of Theodoret, is a collection of lives of the most eminent Eastern saints, chiefly the anchorites of Syria and Egypt; some of these were contemporary with the writer, some lived as far back as the times of persecution. The *Lives* are thirty-one in number; the subjects of the three last being the female saints Marana, Cyra, and Domnica. Of the tone which pervades the entire, we may say in general, that it is calm, confident, and unhesitating. The facts are told not in the light of strange and incredible marvels, but as involving no difficulty of belief. Many of them are stated upon the writer's personal authority; others he professes to have

* See Vol. xv. pp. 485, and seq., also Vol. xxx., p. 115-52. The "*Sign of the Cross*."

heard from eye-witnesses; but his manner throughout is quite natural and self-assured, exhibiting not the smallest semblance of doubt upon his own part, and so entirely free from the appearance of expecting a difficult belief at the hands of the reader, as on the contrary, to seem to suppose that his relations will be received without hesitation, and almost without enquiry.

Now the reader who has been bred up in sentiments of pity for the blindness of the Romanists in receiving the miraculous legends popular in the modern Church, will be not a little surprised if he only examine the sort of legends which were thus put forward without fear by the ecclesiastical historian of the fourth century, and received without hesitation by his contemporaries. To give an adequate idea of them it would, in fact, be necessary to translate the entire volume; we can but select a few specimens; but we willingly challenge a comparison of these sacred biographies with the Lives of the Saints popular in the modern Church. Unquestionably, as regards the marvellous and supernatural, the ancient legends will hardly yield to the most exaggerated of the modern.

Thus of one saint, James, Bishop of Nisibis, (who lived in the persecution of Diocletian, and was present at the great Council of Nice,) an anecdote is told similar to that related of a modern saint, that a party of beggars who, in order to impose upon his charity, feigned that one of their number was dead, were punished by God by finding that their fiction had proved a fatal reality.*

Another anecdote of the same saint would be, we doubt not, pronounced yet more "unmistakably modern." A number of young women who were washing at a fountain exhibited great indelicacy of demeanour as he passed by. In punishment of their crime, he caused the fountain to be miraculously dried up, and struck the culprits with premature gray hairs; † and again, at the prayers of the inhabitants, he prevented the remission of the punishment.

* App. iii., p. 112. (Halle Ed.) We may add, as a specimen of the faith of the period upon another important principle of Catholic belief, what Theodoret subjoined, viz., that St. James offered prayers for him as for one dead, and besought God to remit to him the sins which he had committed in life, [*ἀφείναι τα κατὰ τὸν βίον πλημμελήεντα*] and to admit him into the choir of the just.

† Ibid, p. 1110.

Imagine again a story of a widow's son falling into a deep well while his mother was engaged in discharging the duties of hospitality to a holy hermit; and in reward of his mother's good actions, being discovered after a considerable interval not only safe and unhurt, but placidly floating upon the surface of the water, without the smallest trace of alarm or anxiety, and full of wonder and delight at the superhuman beauty of a youth, by whom, he said, he had been kept from sinking in the water. Where shall we find a more marvellous legend than this, even in Jacobus a Voragine himself? Yet this is but one of many wonders attributed by Theodoret to Julian the Hermit.* Another saint, Marcian, while engaged in prayer, is observed by one of his disciples to be watched by a fierce dragon, who appears ready to spring upon him; but on the disciple's apprizing him of the presence of the monster, he makes the sign of the cross, and the dragon vanishes.† Of another, Simon the Younger, it is told that a converted Israelite who, in his presence, had made a vow of perpetual abstinence from meat, and on one occasion was tempted to eat a portion of a fowl, was punished by its turning to stone upon his lips.‡ A rich man who was remarkable for his harshness and severity towards his tenantry, treated with contempt the remonstrances of the holy anchorite, Masymas. His mules, as a judgment on his heartlessness, refused to draw his chariot, nor was he able to proceed upon his journey till the wheels were released by the intercession of the saint.§ An unhappy wife || recovered the affections of her unfaithful husband by means of a little oil, blessed by the hermit Aphraates. A poor man who had but a single field, the produce of which was the sole support of his family, applied for protection during a dreadful visitation of the plague of locusts, to the same hermit. The hermit blessed a vessel of water, and directed him to sprinkle it around the boundaries of his field. The locusts as soon as they reached the line thus sanctified by his prayer, were arrested as by a wall, and the field remained uninjured.¶

Some of these wonders, too, are related as having taken

* Ibid, 1132-3.

† Ibid, 1140.

‡ Ibid, 1277.

§ Ibidem.

|| Ibid, 1218.

¶ Ibid, 1184.

place without the knowledge of the miraculous agent. In a period of famine, application was made to Zebimas, an Egyptian anchorite, to bless the oil jars of some of his poor neighbours, who trusted that his prayer would procure a miraculous increase of their exhausted store. His humility revolting at the idea of such a favour from God, he declined their request. But the faith of the applicants was stronger than his own. While he was engaged in prayer, they placed the jar, without his being aware of it, behind his back. Their confidence was rewarded, and the desired blessing was accorded.* While Marcian, already alluded to, was praying at night in his cell, a ray of light from heaven, [ὅν λυχνάιον, οὐδε χειροποίητον, ἀλλὰ θεόδοτον] was observed by his disciples playing around his brows.† St. Macedonius, while similarly engaged, was seen by some shepherds to be attended by two angels, who ministered to him as he prayed.

Frequent instances, too, are recorded of the interposition of Providence, for the purpose of protecting his saints from injury, similar to those familiar in the more modern hagiographers. The arm of a shepherd, who, mistaking the solitary Acepsimas for a wild beast, was about to discharge his sling at him, was miraculously staid.‡ A master, who sought to violate his slave, was seized with a supernatural blindness, so as to be unable to see her; § and at the prayers of the hermit Zeno, the Isaurians, who had made an incursion into the district in which he resided, were smitten with sudden blindness, and completely defeated,|| and the holy man himself saw three angels engaged upon the side of the christian army.¶

Many instances, too, are recorded of miraculous interpositions in vindication of the calumniated honours of the saints. A dead body which was treacherously placed at the door of the cell of Palladius, in order to involve him in the charge of the murder, was supernaturally compelled to point with its dead hand to the real culprit, and thus free the saint from the charge.** St. Peter compelled the devil, who had taken possession of a servant, to relate the entire history of the possession; and Simon the elder was

* Ibid. 1262.

† Ibid, 1139.

‡ Ibid, 1240.

§ Ibid, 1193.

|| Ibid, 1204.

¶ Ibid,

** Ibid. 1172.

enabled to discover hidden crimes, however studiously concealed by the delinquent.*

Coincidences, too, with more modern miraculous narratives are frequently discoverable. The possibility of visions and revelations were no less freely admitted than it has been at a more recent period. The hermit Julian saw in a vision which he related before the event, the death of Julian the apostate, and the consequent delivery of the Church;† and the instances of such predictions are too familiar to require special enumeration. Another very curious coincidence with modern practice, is related as having occurred in the case of Theodoret himself. The marriage of his parents had been for years an unfruitful one. At length his mother sought the intercession of a holy solitary Macedonius, of whom numberless miracles are recorded. He promised that, as the reward of her faith, a son should be granted to her prayers, but required as a condition that she should *dedicate him to the sacred ministry*.‡

It would be easy to multiply examples of the thoroughly supernatural character of these sacred biographies. But we have already said more than enough to illustrate the spirit of the period, and to exhibit the easy faith both of its writers and its readers. In truth, there is not a page of the "Religious History" of Theodoret, that does not furnish a commentary upon the sentiment with which he prefaces the life of St. Maro, that while the physicians of the body apply to every disease its own special and peculiar remedy, the prayers of the saints are a panacea common to all possible ills.§

Now we suppose no one will for a moment doubt that if a volume such as has been described were to be put now-a-days into the hands of a protestant, he would at once set it down as a sample of "Romish" credulity, and that he would lay all these reputed extravagancies at the door of the corrupt and superstitious schools to which it has given birth. It would be hard to persuade him that it was otherwise; much more to induce him to believe that the author was not alone a member of the ancient church, but one of the most distinguished and learned men of his day; that his authority as a historian stands deservedly high; that his other writings are freely used by pro-

* 1169.

† Ibid. 1131.

‡ Ib. 1213.

§ Ib. 1222.

testants themselves, in the Arian controversy, and that one of the most popular objections from tradition against the doctrine of transubstantiation, is founded upon a passage from one of his works, which in comparison with the "*Religious History*," it certainly would be difficult not to regard as of minor importance.

It is plain, therefore, that to look upon the miraculous and supernatural narratives, popularly known under the name of "*Legends of Saints*," as the growth of modern or mediæval times, is a gross and palpable delusion. The readers who, in the third century, received without incredulity the relation of Attalus's revelation, would not have hesitated, provided sufficient evidence were produced, to admit the revelations of St. Thomas or St. Bonaventure, had they survived until that age. The writer who produced the *Religious History*, would have equally compiled the *Legenda Aurea*; and the popularity which we know the former to have attained, not alone in the east, but in the west,* is an evidence which no reasonable man can overlook, that the spirit of the fourth and fifth centuries was, in this particular, perfectly identical with that of the thirteenth.

Of course we shall not be regarded as accepting unreservedly the miraculous narratives of either period. The church of the fourth century, is not committed to *the truth or authenticity* of these recitals; neither is the Church of the fifteenth. But the sense of the faithful in both periods is clearly exhibited in both, as testifying to *the possibility*, and even to the congruity of these or similar manifestations of the divine power, through the hands of God's servants. And it is this, as it were constitutional, character of mind, which is necessary to a full appreciation of the Catholic view of these subjects, and such as these. It will be easy, therefore, to understand how a writer like Mrs. Jameson, even while seeking most jealously to avoid every sort of offence to a Catholic reader, must be sure notwithstanding, at least negatively, to clash with the feelings of Catholics, perhaps in the very act by which she sought to conciliate them.

But while we have thought it necessary to be thus explicit in stating our own views, lest the high opinion which we are bound to express regarding the literary merits of her

* See St. John Damascene, cited in the Preface. T. iii. p. 1098.

work might be construed into an approval of its general tone, we feel that we owe the reader some apology for thus delaying him from matters in themselves more interesting, and the more so, because the length to which these observations have run, will render our notice necessarily brief and unsatisfactory.

The two works, already published by Mrs. Jameson, form, as will at once be understood, parts of the same series. The first regards "scriptural personages and the poetical and traditional saints of the early ages of the Church, as represented in art." The second is devoted to the saints of the monastic orders, and those immediately connected therewith. A third part, and probably the most interesting and beautiful of all, is already promised under the title of "Legends of the Madonna."

The arrangement of the first series is somewhat arbitrary, but on the whole the division of the subjects is tolerably complete and satisfactory. Beginning, after a brief general introduction, with the artistic representation of angels and archangels (a subject which she treats, perhaps, more successfully than any other in the volume), she considers in succession the Evangelists, the Apostles, the Doctors of the Church, the Penitents, the Patrons, and Patronesses of Christendom, the Martyrs, the Bishops, the Hermits, and the Warrior Saints. Many of the latter divisions are far from being complete, nor was it indeed to be expected, that within so small a compass it should be otherwise; but although the work no where makes pretension to original research, and in many places betrays marks of haste and inaccuracy, yet it contains a vast amount of curious and interesting matter, arranged in a pleasing and attractive style. It would plainly be idle to attempt any detailed account of the several parts, and we shall therefore content ourselves with a few examples of the general manner.

We are particularly struck by the justice and simplicity of the following observations on a peculiarity of the early christian schools of art, which has often been the subject of criticism, and, indeed, of ridicule; we mean the seeming anachronisms with which it abounds.

"Our ancestors of the middle ages were not particular in drawing that strong line of demarcation between the classical, Jewish, and Christian periods of history, that we do. They saw only

Christendom every where ; they regarded the past only in relation to Christianity. Hence we find in the early ecclesiastical monuments and edifices such a strange assemblage of pagan, scriptural, and Christian worthies ; as, Hector of Troy, Alexander the Great, King David, Judas Maccabeus, King Arthur, St. George, Godfrey of Boulogne, Lucretia, Virginia, Judith, St. Elizabeth, St. Bridget (as in the Cross at Nuremberg). In the curious *Manual of Greek Art*, published by Didron, we find the Greek philosophers and poets entering into a scheme of ecclesiastical decoration ; (as in the Cathedral of Ulm) : Solon, Apollonius, Plutarch, Plato, Sophocles, stand together, holding each a scroll, on which is inscribed a passage from their works, interpreted into an allusion to the coming of Christ : and I have seen a picture of the Nativity in which the sybils are dancing hand-in-hand around the cradle of the new-born Saviour. This may appear profane to some, but the comprehension of the whole universe within the pale of Christianity strikes me as being in the most catholic, as well as in the most poetical, spirit.

"But while such assemblages of holy persons are to be considered as quite independent of chronology, we shall find that the selection has been neither capricious nor arbitrary, and, with a little consideration, we shall discover the leading idea in the mind of the artist—that, at least, which was intended to be conveyed to the mind of the spectator, and which was much more intelligible in former times than it is now.

"Sometimes we find certain saints placed in companionship, because they are the joint patrons and protectors of the city or locality for which the picture was painted. Thus in the Bologna pictures we constantly find the bishop St. Petronius, St. Eloy, St. Dominick, and the warrior St. Proculus ; while in the Venetian pictures we have perpetual St. Marks, St. Georges, and St. Catherines.

"Or, secondly, they are connected by kindred powers and attributes. Thus we find St. Sebastian, the patron against pestilence, in company with St. Roch, who ministered to the sick of the plague. Thus St. Catherine and St. Jerome, the two patrons of school theology, are often found in companionship. Where St. Catherine and St. Barbara are found together, the first figures as patroness of the ecclesiastical, and the second of the military, power—or they represent respectively the contemplative and the active life.

"Or, thirdly, they are combined in the fancy by some inevitable association ; as St. Augustine and St. Stephen are often in the same picture, because St. Augustine dedicated some of his most eloquent works to the glory of the martyr.

"Or they were friends on earth, for which reason St. Cyprian and St. Cornelius are placed together.

"Or their relics repose in the same spot ; whence St. Stephen and

St. Laurence have become almost inseparable. When St. Vincent and St. Laurence are placed together, (as in a lovely composition of Parmigiano, where they sit reading out of the same book), it is because of the similarity of their fate, and that the popular tradition supposed them to be brothers.

"A point of more general importance, and capable of more definite explanation, is the predominance of certain sacred personages in particular schools of Art. St. Cosmo and St. Damian, for instance, are perpetually recurring in the Florentine pictures as the patron saints of the Medici family. In the Lombard pictures St. Ambrose is often found without his compeers—not as doctor of the Church, but as bishop of Milan. In the Siena pictures, we may look for the nun St. Catherine of Siena, and St. Ansano, the apostle of the Sienese, holding his banner and palm. And in the Augustine chapels and churches St. Augustine figures, not as doctor of the Church, but as patriarch of the Order.

"A bishop-martyr, holding his palm, and not otherwise designated either by name or attribute, would be—in one of Perugino's pictures, St. Ercolano or St. Costanzo; in a Florentine picture, St. Donato or St. Romulo; if the picture were painted in the March of Ancona, it would probably be St. Apollinaris of Ravenna; at Naples it would be St. Januarius; at Paris, or in a picture painted for a French church, of which there are many in Italy, it would be St. Denis; and in German prints, St. Boniface or St. Lambert. I need not further multiply examples."—*Legendary Art*, pp. 9–10.

The observations upon symbols, too, are very judicious and instructive;—not only the general remarks in the introduction, but those which are interspersed in the several departments of the work. The enumeration of symbols, however, is far from complete; nor are the explanations, in all cases, perfectly accurate. For example, it is a great mistake to represent the figure of the PELICAN as a symbol merely of "*our redemption through Christ*." (*Legendary Art*. p. 13.) This signification is, undoubtedly, contained under the emblem, because the sacrifice of the Cross is identical with that of the Eucharist: but its true use is as a type of *the blessed Eucharist*. Indeed, it is only in this sense that it can bear its full and complete signification—that of the bird's *feeding its young with its blood*: and it is frequently found combined with other emblems of the blessed Eucharist, which it is impossible to mistake.

We have already observed that Mrs. Jameson, in her treatment of legends, confines herself, or at least seeks to confine herself, to the artistic view of the subject. She seldom enters into a discussion of their historical truth or

probability; and although there is often a seeming tendency to dwell upon, or at least to bring prominently forward, the strangest and most improbable circumstances of the tradition, yet it can seldom be said to be done in a spirit of levity, and hardly even in a tone of ridicule. On the contrary, in most cases the tone of the narrative is sufficiently grave and solemn; in many it is almost as reverent as we should desire. We regret very much that the space which remains at our disposal, is too limited to admit of our introducing many passages which we had marked for extract. Perhaps the following account of the well-known legend of St. Peter, the *DOMINE QUO VADIS*, may serve as a specimen of the general treatment, both religious and artistical, of such subjects.

"The next subject in the order of events is styled the '*DOMINE, QUO VADIS?*' After the burning of Rome, Nero threw upon the Christians the accusation of having fired the city. This was the origin of the first persecution, in which many perished by terrible and hitherto unheard-of deaths. The Christian converts besought Peter not to expose his life, which was dear and necessary to the well-being of all; and at length he consented to depart from Rome. But as he fled along the Appian Way, about two miles from the gates, he was met by a vision of our Saviour travelling towards the city. Struck with amazement, he exclaimed, 'Lord! whither goest Thou?' to which the Saviour, looking upon him with a mild sadness, replied, 'I go to Rome to be crucified a second time,' and vanished. Peter, taking this for a sign that he was to submit himself to the sufferings prepared for him, immediately turned back, and re-entered the city. Michael Angelo's famous statue, now in the church of S. Maria-sopra-Minerva at Rome, is supposed to represent Christ as he appeared to Peter on this occasion; and a cast or copy of it is in the little church of '*Domine quo vadis?*' erected on the spot sanctified by this mysterious meeting.

"It is surprising that this most beautiful, picturesque, and, to my fancy, sublime legend has been so seldom treated; and never, as it appears to me, in a manner worthy of its capabilities and its high significance. It is seldom that a whole story can be told by two figures, and these two figures placed in such grand and dramatic contrast—Christ in His serene majesty and radiant with all the glory of beatitude, yet with an expression of gentle reproach; the apostle at his feet, arrested in his flight, amazed, and yet filled with a trembling joy; and for the background the wide Campagna or the towering walls of imperial Rome;—these are grand materials; but the pictures I have met with are all ineffective in conception. The best fall short of the sublime ideal; most of them are theatrical and commonplace.

"Raphael has interpreted it in a style rather too classical for the spirit of the legend; with great simplicity and dignity, but as a *fact*, rather than a vision conjured up by the stricken conscience and tenderness of the affectionate apostle. The small picture by Annibal Caracci in our National Gallery, is a carefully finished academical study and nothing more, but may be referred to as a fair example of the usual mode of treatment."—*Legendary Art*, p. 123.

It may be well for the reader to know, that the legend which Mrs. Jameson thus slightly introduces, is told without the slightest expression of doubt by St. Ambrose, in his "Discourse against Auxentius, on delivering up Churches."* Her account, too, of the legend of the Fall of Simon Magus, is extremely imperfect. She describes it as founded on some ancient tradition, not wholly unsupported by his trivial testimony. Now, the fact is, that it is not only related circumstantially by St. Justin, in his Apology, by St. Ambrose, St. Cyril of Jerusalem, St. Augustine, Philastrius, Theodore, Isidore of Pelusium, and other christian writers; but is not obscurely referred to by more than one Pagan historian of the reign of Nero. Dion Chrysostomus tells, that Nero kept for a long time in his court a magician, who promised to fly; and Suetonius informs us in addition, that the attempt was really made; that it proved a miserable failure, and that the blood of the unhappy experimentalist actually stained the balcony on which the emperor was seated, for the purpose of witnessing the performance.†

It would be unjust, however, to hold Mrs. Jameson responsible for omissions such as these. They cannot be said fairly to have come within the plan which she proposed. And we have alluded to them only for the purpose of enabling the reader to see that the subject has two distinct phases, the historical and the artistic, and that of these her work only professes to consider the latter. The knowledge of this fact is absolutely necessary, in order to form a just idea, either of Mrs. Jameson's performance, or of the subject of *Legends* itself. Nor can we better explain this necessity than by suggesting, as a supplement to any single one of her notices, the perusal of Alban Butler's critical history of the same subject; in which the history is separated from the ornament of art, and, while the legend

* Opp. II. 867. [Ben. Ed.]

† Suetonius, Nero. cap. 12.

is stripped of all that had been added for the purpose of effect, its true historical foundation is carefully and accurately exhibited.

The second series of *Legendary Art* comprises the "Legends of the Monastic Orders." Of the Introduction, which is prefixed to it, we do not mean to speak. Although we, of course, dissent from Mrs. Jameson's views of the Monastic Institute, we feel that they are perfectly natural in a Protestant; and they are explained in terms which need not offend the most austere Catholic. The plan of the work is very similar to that of the first series. It comprises St. Benedict and the early Benedictines in all the countries of Europe; the Reformed Benedictines; the Augustinians; and their kindred orders; the Mendicant orders;—under which she treats the Franciscans, the Dominicans, and the Carmelites;—and lastly the Jesuits. Speaking strictly according to historical principles, the distribution of subjects in the second series is far from being correct; but for the purposes of art, this strict accuracy of distribution is not required; and at all events, the leading characters of each school are introduced, although not always in precisely that order or connection which we should have preferred. The portion of the volume devoted to the Benedictine institute, and the saints connected with it, appears scarcely commensurate, not only with the historical importance of that great community, but also with the numerous monuments of early art with which they are identified; but the notices, though brief, are, on the whole, satisfactory. St. Francis, St. Antony, St. Dominic, St. Bernard, and especially the "dear Saint Elizabeth" of Hungary, receive a fairer share of notice. There is much in the accounts of each which we would gladly transcribe; but we must content ourselves with a single extract from the *Poetical Legends* of "St. Francis and the Animals," which perhaps will have more novelty than the rest. We need hardly premise that the account of the legend is Mrs. Jameson's own.

"Among the legends of St. Francis, some of the most interesting are those which place him in relation with the lower animals. He looked upon all beings as existing by, and through God; and as having a portion of that divine principle by which he himself existed. He was accustomed to call all living things his brothers and sisters. In the enthusiasm of his charity he interpreted literally the text, 'Go ye into all the world, and preach the Gospel

to every creature.' He appears to have thought that all sentient beings had a share in the divine mission of Christ; and since a part of that divine mission was to enlarge the sphere of our human sympathies, till they embrace *all* our fellow-creatures, it should seem that the more the tender spirit of Christianity is understood and diffused, the more will the lower creation be elevated through our own more elevated intelligence and refined sympathies. Dr. Arnold says, in a striking passage of one of his letters, that 'the destinies of the brute creation appeared to him a mystery which he could not approach without awe.' St. Francis, in his gentle and tender enthusiasm, solved that mystery—at least to himself—by admitting animals within the pale of Christian sympathy. I shall give a few of these legends here, as the best commentary on the subjects above described. It is recorded that when he walked in the fields the sheep and the lambs thronged around him, hares and rabbits nestled in his bosom; but of all living creatures he seems to have loved especially birds of every kind, as being the most unearthly in their nature; and among birds he loved best the dove. 'One day he met, in his road, a young man on his way to Siene to sell some doves, which he had caught in a snare; and Francis said to him, 'Oh, good young man! these are the birds to whom the Scripture compares those who are pure and faithful before God: do not kill them, I beseech thee, but give them rather to me;' and when they were given to him, he put them in his bosom and carried them to his convent at Ravacciano, where he made for them nests, and fed them every day, until they became so tame as to eat from his hand: and the young man had also his recompense; for he became a friar, and lived a holy life from that day forth.'—St. Francis had also a great tenderness for larks, and often pointed out to his disciples the lark mounting to 'heaven's gate,' and singing praises to the Creator, as a proper emblem of Christian aspiration. 'A lark brought her brood of nestlings to his cell, to be fed from his hand: he saw that the strongest of these nestlings tyrannised over the others, pecking at them and taking more than his due share of the food; whereupon the good saint rebuked the creature, saying, 'Thou unjust and insatiable! thou shalt die miserably, and the greediest animals shall refuse to eat thy flesh.' And so it happened, for the creature drowned itself through its impetuosity in drinking, and when it was thrown to the cats they would not touch it.'—On his return from Syria, in passing through the Venetian Lagune, vast numbers of birds were singing, and he said to his companion, 'Our sisters, the birds, are praising their Creator; let us sing with them,'—and he began the sacred service. But the warbling of the birds interrupted them, therefore St. Francis said to them, 'Be silent till we also have praised God,' and they ceased their song, and did not resume it till he had given them permission.'—On another occasion, preaching at Alviano, he could not make himself heard for the chirping of the swallows,

which were at that time building their nests : pausing, therefore, in his sermon, he said, ' My sisters, you have talked enough ; it is time that I should have my turn. Be silent, and listen to the word of God ! ' and they were silent immediately. '—' On another occasion, as he was sitting with his disciple Leo, he felt himself penetrated with joy and consolation by the song of the nightingale, and he desired his friend Leo to raise his voice and sing the praises of God in company with the bird. But Leo excused himself by reason of his bad voice ; upon which Francis himself began to sing, and when he stopped, the nightingale took up the strain, and thus they sang alternately, until the night was far advanced, and Francis was obliged to stop, for his voice failed. Then he confessed that the little bird had vanquished him ; he called it to him, thanked it for its song, and gave it the remainder of his bread ; and having bestowed his blessing upon it, the creature flew away.'

"Here we have a version of the antique legend of the Thessalian Shepherd and the Nightingale : but there the nightingale is vanquished and dies ; here the lesson of humility is given to the man. Mark the distinction between the classic and the Christian sentiment !

"A grasshopper was wont to sit and sing on a fig-tree near the cell of the man of God, and oftentimes by her singing she excited him also to sing the praises of the Creator ; and one day he called her to him, and she flew upon his hand, and Francis said to her, ' Sing, my sister, and praise the Lord thy Creator.' So she began her song immediately, nor ceased till at the father's command she flew back to her own place ; and she remained eight days there, coming and singing at his behest. At length the man of God said to his disciples, ' Let us dismiss our sister ; enough, that she has cheered us with her song, and excited us to the praise of God these eight days.' So, being permitted, she immediately flew away, and was seen no more.'

"When he found worms or insects in his road, he was careful not to tread upon them ; ' he stepped aside, and bid the reptile live.' He would even remove them from the pathway, lest they should be crushed by others.

"One day, in passing through a meadow, he saluted the flocks which were grazing there, and he perceived a poor little lamb which was feeding all alone in the midst of a flock of goats ; he was moved with pity, and he said, ' Thus did our mild Saviour stand alone in the midst of the Jews and the Pharisees.' He would have bought this sheep, but he had nothing in the world but his tunic : however, a charitable man passing by, and seeing his grief, bought the lamb and gave it to him. When he was at Rome, in 1222, he had with him a pet lamb, which accompanied him everywhere ; and in pictures of St. Francis a lamb is frequently introduced, which may either signify his meekness and purity of mind,

or it may represent this very lamb, 'which lay in his bosom, and was to him as a daughter.'"—Monastic Orders, p. 274—8.

It would be unpardonable to close our notice of Mrs. Jameson's *Legends of the Monastic Orders*, without a tribute to the great Dominican artist, Fra Angelico, to whom the religious art, not only of his own order, but of the Church generally, owes so deep a debt. It is introduced in connection with his dear friend and companion St. Antoninus of Florence.

"The story of this good saint is connected in a very interesting manner with the history of art.

"He was born at Florence, of noble parents, about the year 1384. While yet in his childhood the singular gravity of his demeanour, his dislike to all childish sports, and the enthusiasm and fervour with which he was seen to pray for hours before a crucifix of particular sanctity,—then, and I believe now, in the Or San Michele,—caused his parents to regard him as one set apart for the service of God. At the age of fifteen he presented himself at the door of the Dominican convent at Fiesole, and humbly desired to be admitted as a novice. The prior, astonished at the request from one so young, and struck by his diminutive person and delicate appearance, deemed him hardly fit to undertake the duties and austerities imposed on the Order, but would not harshly refuse him. 'What hast thou studied, my son?' he asked, benignly; the boy replied modestly that he had studied the Humanities and the Canon Law. 'Well,' replied the prior, somewhat incredulous, 'return to thy father's house, my son; and when thou hast got by heart the Libro del Decreto, return hither, and thou shalt have thy wish,'—and so with good words dismissed him, not thinking, perhaps, to see him again. Antonino, though not gifted with any extraordinary talents, had an indomitable will, and was not to be frightened by tasks or tests of any kind from a resolution over which he had brooded from infancy. He turned away from the gate of the convent and sought his home. At the end of a year he appeared again before the prior:—'Reverend father, I have learned the book of Decrees by heart; will you now admit me?' The good prior, recovering from his astonishment, put him to the proof, found that he could repeat the whole book as if he held it in his hand, and therefore, seeing clearly that it was the will of God that it should be so, he admitted him into the brotherhood, and sent him to Cortona to study during the year of his noviciate. At the end of that period, he returned to Fiesole and pronounced his vows, being then sixteen. The remainder of his life showed that his had been a true vocation. Lowly, charitable, and studious, he was above all remarkable for the gentle but irresistible power he exercised over others, and which arose not

so much from any idea entertained of his superior talents and judgment, as from confidence in the simplicity of his pure unworldly mind and in his perfect truth.

"Now in the same convent at Fiesole where Antonino made his profession, there dwelt a young friar about the same age as himself, whose name was Fra Giovanni, and who was yet more favoured by Heaven; for to him, in addition to the virtues of humility, charity, and piety, was vouchsafed the gift of surpassing genius. He was a painter: early in life he had dedicated himself and his beautiful art to the service of God and of His most blessed saints; and, that he might be worthy of his high and holy vocation, he sought to keep himself unspotted from the world, for he was accustomed to say that 'those who work for Christ must dwell in Christ.' Ever before he commenced a picture which was to be consecrated to the honour of God, he prepared himself with fervent prayer and meditation, and then he began, in humble trust that it would be put into his mind what he ought to delineate; and he would never change nor deviate from the first idea, for, as he said, "*that was the will of God; (così fusse la volontà di Dio;)* and this he said, not in presumption, but in faith and simplicity of heart. So he passed his life in imaging those visions of beatitude which descended on his fancy, sent indeed by no fabled Muse, but even by that Spirit 'that doth prefer before all temples the upright heart and pure; and surely never before nor since was earthly material worked up into soul, nor earthly forms refined into spirit, as under the hand of this most pious and most excellent painter. He became sublime by the force of his own goodness and humility. It was as if Paradise had opened upon him, a Paradise of rest and joy, of purity and love, where no trouble, no guile, no change could enter: and if, as it has been said, his celestial creations seem to want power, not the less do we feel that they need it not,—that before those ethereal beings power itself would be powerless: such are his angels, resistless in their soft serenity; such his virgins, pure from all earthly stain; such his redeemed spirits, gliding into Paradise; such his sainted martyrs and confessors, absorbed in devout rapture. Well has he been named IL BEATO and ANGELICO whose life was 'participate with angels' even in this world!

"Now this most excellent and favoured Giovanni, and the good and gentle-hearted Antonino, dwelling together in their youth within the narrow precincts of their convent, came to know and to love each other well. And no doubt the contemplative and studious mind of Antonino nourished with spiritual learning the genius of the painter, while the realisation of his own teaching grew up before him in hues and forms more definite than words, and more harmonious than music; and when in after years they parted, and Antonino was sent by his superiors to various convents, to restore, by his mild influence, relaxed discipline,—and Angelico by

the same authority to various churches and convents at Florence, Cortona, Arezzo, Orvieto, to adorn them with his divine skill,—the two friends never forgot each other.

"Many years passed away, in which each fulfilled his vocation, walking humbly before God; when at length the fame of Angelico having gone forth through all Italy, the Pope called him to Rome, to paint for him there a chapel of wondrous beauty, with the pictured actions and sufferings of those two blessed martyrs, St. Stephen and St. Laurence, whose remains repose together without the walls of Rome; and while Angelico was at his work, the Pope took pleasure in looking on and conversing with him, and was filled with reverence for his pure and holy life, and for his wisdom, which, indeed, was not of this world.

"At this period the Archbishop of Florence died, and the Pope was much troubled to fill his place, for the times were perilous, and the Florentines were disaffected to the Church.

"One day, conversing with Angelico, and more than ever struck with his simplicity, his wisdom, and his goodness, he offered him the dignity of Archbishop; and great was the surprise of the Holy Father when the painter entreated that he would choose another, being himself addicted to his art, and not fit to guide or instruct or govern men; adding, that he knew of one far more worthy than himself, one of his own brotherhood, a man who feared God and loved the poor,—learned, discreet, and faithful: and he named the Frate Antonino, who was then acting in Naples as Vicar-General. When the Pope heard that name, it was as if a sudden light broke through the trouble and darkness of his mind; he wondered that he had not thought of him before, as he was precisely the man best fitted for the office. Antonino therefore, was appointed Archbishop of Florence, to the great joy of the Florentines, for he was their countryman, and already beloved and honoured for the sanctity and humility of his life: when raised to his new dignity he became the model of a wise and good prelate, maintaining peace among his people, and distinguished not only by his charity but his justice and his firmness."—*Monastic Orders*, pp. 415—418.

We shall probably have occasion to return to this interesting work, on the publication of the third series, "*Legends of the Madonna.*" But we cannot part from it at present without expressing once again the exceeding gratification which we have received from the volumes already published. The form selected for the second Series, and for the second edition of the first, is admirably adapted for the display of the illustrations, which are introduced with almost lavish profusion; and the spirit and expressiveness which, generally speaking, distinguish them

all, even those of the slightest and least pretentious character, place the publication, even as mere specimen of mechanical art, in the very highest rank of ornamental typography.

As a contribution to the study of sacred art, we can scarcely exaggerate its value; and although its direct tendency is far from Catholic, and bears but remotely upon religious belief, we cannot help anticipating from its circulation, and from the tastes which it cannot fail to create, or to stimulate, the same results in influencing the religious opinions of its readers, to which the kindred study of sacred architecture, although undertaken with precisely the same views, has so largely and so notoriously contributed in England.

ART. VII.—*London Labour and the London Poor.* By HENRY MAYHEW. Vol. i. London, 1851.

IF we wish fully to sound the depths of misery, moral or physical, of society, it is to the great cities that we must resort. Thither, and particularly to capitals, all extremes tend and flow; and there we shall find mixed up together, the splendour, the refinement, the graces, the culture, the pomps and the luxuries of life on the one side; and all its wretchedness, squalor, ignorance, privation and despair on the other. Perhaps we are wrong in saying that we find them mixed together. In England at least, where there is more theoretical equality and democracy than elsewhere, there is a natural process of gravitation, by which poverty and suffering sink ever lower and lower, and leave the higher tenants of earthly life floating or gliding on the surface, unencumbered with their annoyance. The very whereabouts of poverty in London are an unknown region to the wealthy; its existence is an evil often confounded with low vice or imposture, or at least with poor-rates and parochial business. In the country the course of misfortune or negligence is short and simple. From the farm house to the labourer's cottage, and from

this to the Union, makes but two steps. But in London, there are innumerable gradations between the humbly independent tradesman, and the absolute beggar: and even when we have reached this lowest depth of ordinary society, there opens upon us a still lower deep, or series of abysses, down, down through every stage of vice, profligacy, and crime, into the very infernal pool of professional, heartless, and hopeless, depravity.

The accumulation, in one place, of so many fermenting elements of humanity, has always been a cause of alarm to statesmen, whose minds are able to rise above political littleness. Proletarianism was the dread of ancient Rome, and has been the scourge of modern Paris. It is yet a dormant power with us; and we despise it. The Roman chiefs, republican or imperial, humoured and coaxed the monster: built for it huge granaries, baths and amphitheatres; showered on it largesses, fed it with "bread and Circensian games;" stuffed and deadened its maw with troops of gladiators and bloody frays; and, as its appetite became more carnivorous, imported packs of lions and leopards, and hunted Christians for its sport. The French nation, a generation back, bent its neck to the guillotine which it erected in every market-place; and one cannot read the horrible scenes of the *Carmes*, or the *Abbaye Saint-Germain*, with their mob of male demons and female furies, and not shudder at the thought of what the evil-roused energies of this sleeping dragon may become. And lately, after the Roman-like policy of drugging and soothing by *ateliers nationaux* has been vainly tried, it has required an entire army paraded daily before it, face to face, with old Algerine generals at the head, to keep it in awe and check.

In England we are trying, and so far successfully, another course. The strong arm of the law is able to repress, the very first ruffling of its scales, and it lies cowering at the feet of the civil power. It is however perfectly amazing to contemplate, what an immense amount of activity, vigilance, legislation, and force are actually in constant employment, to keep down the vice and crime which belong to the poorer class. For in reality, a culprit at the bar, of even the class of a *Rush*, or a *Mrs. Manning*, is a rare object of wonder: and a captain confined for ten days has formed a new epoch in magisterial jurisprudence. So used are we to identify

poverty and delinquency, that our very compassion embodies itself in a penitentiary form, and our charity confounds relief with incarceration. Yet we speak not now of the workhouse or poor-law systems, which entail so much expense and keep up such a system of activity; but allude to the more judiciary forms of coercion. While Chancery reform bills that slumber and linger through successive sessions are for the rich; for the poor, in most part, are acts permitting summary convictions, or prohibiting the sale of poisons, which run rapidly through both houses. For them is the army of our admirable police; for them the daily labour of not quite so admirable magistrates; for them the gloomy prison van takes its frequent journeys, and new model gaols raise their dreary walls.

This is indeed a melancholy law of society: that the wisdom, education, influence and energy of one class should have to be constantly engaged in studying how to correct, to punish, and to check the other. Theoretically, we may say, justice is equal: and the dock is for rich that offends, as for poor. But practically it is otherwise: the rich and high portion of society is represented by judge and bar; the destitute and wretched by the culprit. This however has been from time immemorial the state of things; and therefore we have called it a law of society. But the work to which we wish to introduce our readers, and which must arouse attention to the brooding elements of London proletarianism, exposes, we think, an unwarrantable readiness to sacrifice the interests and very subsistence of the poor, to the mere comfort or avarice of the rich. The patient, persevering stall-keeper is driven mercilessly away from a standing of many years, on which his all depends, because it is inconvenient to the plate-glass shop opposite; and the industrious boy or woman is driven harshly from the street-side, where their bread is to be earned, because their presence narrows the path to the wealthy citizen, as he hurries to the city, to make in a few hours what would give them a capital for life.* It is a wise, as well as a holy saying: "The rich and the poor man have met; the Maker of both is the Lord." (Prov. xxii. 2.) The one should not be rudely jostled from the other's path; lest one day he may place himself sturdily

* See p. 59 of our work.

across it. Let them walk side by side, and see and know one another better, and judge more kindly of each other. Let not the rich draw his knowledge of the poor from the police reports: and let not the poor form his estimate of the rich, from tales of profligacy in penny Sunday papers. We are much mistaken if Mr. Mayhew's embassy from a higher sphere to the poor or destitute classes will not lead to some softening of the latter's feelings: and we are sure, that the publication of his negotiations among this, to the wealthy, newly-discovered race, will open the minds of many to more generous thoughts and kindlier efforts in its favour, than have entered there before.

The researches among the poor, presented in the serial before us, were first undertaken for a daily paper. It is no concern of ours what led to the separation of its writer from this periodical, and to the present form of his work. We are glad to have it as it appears, and to make it known to our readers. We cannot hope to give any thing like an adequate account of its interest; but we trust to excite this feeling in others, and thus induce them to read and to ponder it.

The portion of the work before us relates to "The Street-folk," that is to people who get their living, by occupation professedly honest, in the thoroughfares of London. Even this part of the subject is not yet completed; but we are sure that every reader will be startled, as we have been, at the details here collected and brought before him. And first let us see the generic classification of the "street-folk;" and that some idea may be formed of their further subdivision into species, we will give Mr. Mayhew's general view, with the further division of his first class.

"OF THE LONDON STREET-FOLK.

"Those who obtain their living in the streets of the metropolis are a very large and varied class; indeed, the means resorted to in order 'to pick up a crust,' as the people call it, in the public thoroughfares (and such in many instances it *literally* is), are so multifarious that the mind is long baffled in its attempts to reduce them to scientific order or classification.

"It would appear, however, that the street-people may be all arranged under six distinct genera or kinds.

"These are severally:

"I. STREET-SELLERS.

"II. STREET-BUYERS.

"III. STREET-FINDERS.

"IV. STREET-PERFORMERS, ARTISTS, AND SHOWMEN.

"V. STREET-ARTIZANS, OR WORKING PEDLARS; and

"VI. STREET-LABOURERS.

"The first of these divisions—the STREET-SELLERS—includes many varieties; viz.—

"1. *The Street-sellers of Fish, &c.*—'wet,' 'dry,' and shell fish—and poultry, game, and cheese.

"2. *The Street-sellers of Vegetables*, fruit (both 'green' and 'dry'), flowers, trees, shrubs, seeds, and roots, and 'green stuff,' as (water-cresses, chickweed and grun'sel, and turf).

"3. *The Street-sellers of Eatables and Drinkables*,—including the vendors of fried fish, hot eels, pickled whelks, sheep's trotters, ham sandwiches, peas'-soup, hot green peas, penny pies, plum 'duff,' meat-puddings, baked potatoes, spice-cakes, muffins and crumpets, Chelsea buns, sweetmeats, brandy-balls, cough drops, and cat and dog's meat—such constituting the principal eatables sold in the street; while under the head of street drinkables may be specified tea and coffee, ginger-beer, lemonade, hot wine, new milk from the cow, ass's milk, curds and whey, and occasionally water.

"4. *The Street-sellers of Stationery, Literature, and the Fine Arts*—among whom are comprised the flying stationers, or standing and running patterers; the long-song-sellers; the wall-song-sellers, (or 'pinners-up,' as they are technically termed); the ballad sellers; the vendors of play-bills, second editions of newspapers, back numbers of periodicals and old books, almanacks, pocket books, memorandum books, note paper, sealing-wax, pens, pencils, stenographic cards, valentines, engravings, manuscript music, images, and gelatine poetry cards.

"5. *The Street-sellers of Manufactured Articles*, which class comprises a large number of individuals, as, (a) the vendors of chemical articles of manufacture—viz., blacking, lucifers, corn-salves, grease removing compositions, plating-balls, poison for rats, crackers, detonating-balls, and cigar lights. (b) The vendors of metal articles of manufacture—razors and pen-knives, tea-trays, dog-collars, and key-rings, hardware, bird-cages, small coins, medals, jewellery, tinware, tools, card-counters, red-herring-toasters, trivets, gridirons, and Dutch ovens. (c) The vendors of china and stone articles of manufacture—as cups and saucers, jugs, vases, chimney ornaments, and stone fruit. (d) The vendors of linen, cotton, and silken articles of manufacture—as sheeting, table-covers, cotton, tapes and thread, boot and stay-laces, haberdashery, pretended smuggled goods, shirt-buttons, etc., etc.; and (e) the vendors of miscellaneous articles of manufacture—as cigars, pipes, and snuff-boxes, spectacles, combs, 'lots,' rhubarb, sponges, wash-leather, paper-hangings, dolls, Bristol toys, sawdust, and pin-cushions.

"6. *The Street-sellers of Second-hand Articles*, of whom there are again four separate classes; as (a) those who sell old metal articles—viz. old knives and forks, keys, tin-ware, tools, and marine stores

generally ; (b) those who sell old linen articles—as old sheeting for towels ; (c) those who sell old glass and crockery—including bottles, old pans and pitchers, old looking-glasses, &c. ; and (d) those who sell old miscellaneous articles—as old shoes, old clothes, old saucepan lids, &c., &c.

"7. *The Street-sellers of Live Animals*—including the dealers in dogs, squirrels, birds, gold and silver fish, and tortoises.

"8. *The Street-sellers of Mineral Productions and Curiosities*—as red and white sand, silver sand, coals, coke, salt, spar ornaments, and shells.

"These so far as my experience goes, exhaust the whole class of street-sellers, and they appear to constitute nearly three-fourths of the entire number of individuals obtaining a subsistence in the streets of London."—p. 3.

When it is considered that the vendor of each sort of *friandises* enumerated in paragraphs 1, 2, and 3, gives the subject of a separate section, the reader will be able to form some idea of the minuteness and extent to which Mr. Mayhew has stretched his labours. Indeed, although while we are writing, the work has reached the completion of its first volume, we shall be obliged to confine our attention to the first half, as containing quite sufficient for one article.

The first class to which we have alluded, as described in the three first paragraphs, is generally distinguished by the name of costermongers ; and it certainly deserves more special notice than any other. These may be said to form a race apart in the midst of the London population. They live together in particular localities ; have customs, ideas, systems, virtues, vices, education, occupation, modes of carrying on business, and of spending money, domestic moralities, and social principles, nay, costume and language, so similar, as to entitle them to form a community of themselves. It is impossible to read the account of them without sympathy and interest. There is much simplicity and kindness mixed with dishonesty and cunning, much independence of character, with great curiosity about higher ranks, coarseness of feeling, and rude luxury in taste, which give a peculiar savour to the composition of this class, distinct from others of the industrious poor. They are, moreover, almost instinctively a roaming, out of door people, whose children inherit the restlessness of their parents, as in all nomadic tribes ; and, like these, there is a lawlessness of character, and an innate hatred of restraint,

which make them consider the enforcers and representatives of order as natural born foes, to be at all times dreaded, and if possible, sometimes thrashed. It will be owned, that an insulated body, growing up in the heart of the population, with considerable idiosyncracies, and but slight attachments to the body that contains it, forms a dangerous element in society, and deserves a peculiar treatment, to prevent its becoming the source, or seat, of morbid action. Such a people are like the Jews in Poland, or the Gitanos in Spain, or the Boers in our Cape colonies,—unincorporated subjects, who never mingle with, nor get fairly into solution, but are only floating or suspended, in the community in which they live. Perhaps this danger is rather increased than diminished by the circumstance, that here the semi-extraneous family which exists in the midst of us, does not belong to another and a weaker race; but has all the energies and powers, physical and moral, of the national population.

Mr. Mayhew takes different modes of calculating the number of costermongers in London; and arrives at the conclusion, that there are 30,000 men, women, and children, who depend for their livelihood on the street-trade in vegetables, fruit, and fish. Here, then, is the population of a considerable city engaged in only the provision department of street-traffic. This may give us some idea of what the metropolis really is. One may live years in it, and never know what forms the occupation of tens of thousands of its inhabitants. Early in the morning, a few cries of water-cresses, or vegetables, sound along the street, too early for them to be heard by the rich or great; in the course of the day a truck-full of what are considered vulgar flowers, or a basket-full of what will be considered refuse strawberries, will be pushed or carried round the square, to tempt the humbler portions of the lordly household. These indications, probably overlooked, are the only ones that reach the eye of our legislators of the existence of a whole army, who, scattered over the vast space of London, but condensed into a mass by the unity of class, have to find their living by this precarious occupation.

It is not, however, among the rich, nor in their haunts, that the labours, the industry, the losses or the gains, of this class of traders find their place; but they carry on the traffic of large neighbourhoods, dependent mainly on them for food. Every morning, says Mr. Mayhew, there are the

following number of "costermongers attending the London markets: Billingsgate-market, 3,500; Covent-garden, 4,000; Spitalfields, 1,000; Borough, 250; Leadenhall, 100;—total, 9,350. Besides these, I am credibly informed, that it may be assumed, there are full 1,000 men who are unable to attend market, owing to the dissipation of the previous night; another 1,000 are absent owing to their having 'stock on hand,' and so requiring no fresh purchases." With the stock thus prepared, this multitude sallies forth; and by dint of perambulating, bawling, coaxing, and too often, lying, must have got rid of it by evening. This may give us some idea of the multitude who carry on their trade in the streets; but we believe our readers will be startled when they see the figures that express the amount of traffic thus carried on.

Thus, it will be hardly credited, that among these peripatetic merchants of London, the sum paid for rent of barrows to carry round their commodities, amounts annually to £16,250. But Mr. Mayhew's general conclusion on this head will better express the magnitude of this business.

"We may then, I think, safely assert, that the gross yearly receipts of the London costermongers are two millions of money; that their clear annual gain or income, is £425,000; and that the capital invested in their business, in the form of donkey-carts, barrows, baskets, weights, and stock-money, is £25,000; half of this being borrowed, for which they pay upwards of £20,000 interest per annum."—p. 120.

Now here we have really a trade which would make the wealth of a considerable commercial town. So huge in all its limbs is London! We must now, however, give more in detail the incredible amount of merchandise upon which this commerce is exercised, and we will divide it into fish, vegetables, and flowers or shrubs, and game.

It would not be thought, from superficial observation, that fish furnishes the most extensive branch of the street trade. It is but little seen hawked in the wealthier quarters of the city, and we are sure that none of our readers can be prepared for the returns which this traffic yields. The following is the quantity of "wet fish" sold every year in the streets of London, out of shops and mainly to the poor.

	No. of Fish.	lbs. weight.
" Salmon	20,000	175,000
Live-cod	100,000	1,000,000
Soles	6,500,000	1,650,000
Whiting	4,440,000	1,680,000
Haddock	250,000	500,000
Plaice	29,400,000	29,400,000
Mackarel	15,700,000	15,700,000
Herrings	875,000,000	210,000,000
Sprats	"	3,000,000
Eels, from Holland	400,000	65,000
Flounders	260,000	43,000
Dabs	270,000	48,000

Total quantity of wet fish } 932,340,000 263,281,000 "
sold in the streets of London.

Now this is but one part of the food destined to satisfy the piscivorous maw of London town; to it we have to add the dry, or salt, and the shell fish. We will give their numbers in the table which states the value yearly spent in the streets on these commodities. It is as follows:

<i>" Wet Fish.</i>	£
175,000 lbs. of salmon, at 6 <i>d.</i> per lb.....	4,000
1,000,000 lbs. of live cod, at 1½ <i>d.</i> per lb....	5,000
3,250,000 pairs of soles, at 1½ <i>d.</i> per pair...	20,000
4,400,000 whiting, at ½ <i>d.</i> each	9,000
29,400,000 plaice, at ⅓ <i>d.</i>	90,000
15,700,000 mackarel, at 6 for 1 <i>s.</i>	130,000
875,000,000 herrings, at 16 a groat.....	900,000
3,000,000 lbs. of sprats, at 1 <i>d.</i> per lb.	12,000
400,000 lbs. of eels, at 3 lbs. for 1 <i>s.</i>	6,000
260,000 flounders, at 1 <i>d.</i> per doz.	100
270,000 dabs, at 1 <i>d.</i> per dozen..	100

Sum total expended yearly in wet fish..... 1,177,000

<i>" Dry Fish.</i>	
525,000 lbs. barrelled cod, at 1½ <i>d.</i>	3,000
500,000 lbs. dried salt cod, at 2 <i>d.</i>	4,000
4,875,000 smoked haddock, at 1 <i>d.</i>	20,000
36,750,000 bloaters, at 2 for 1 <i>d.</i>	75,000
25,000,000 red herrings, at 4 for 1 <i>d.</i>	25,000

Sum total expended yearly in dry fish..... 127,000

" Shell Fish.

124,000,000 oysters, at 4 a penny	125,000
60,000 lobsters, at 3d.....	750
50,000 crabs, at 2d.....	400
770,000 pints of shrimps, at 2d.	6,000
1,000,000 quarts of mussels, at 1d.....	4,000
750,000 quarts of cockles, at 1d.	3,000
4,950,000 whelks, at 8 for 1d.....	2,500
3,600,000 pints of periwinkles, at 1d.....	15,000

Sum total expended yearly in shell-fish..... 156,650

"Adding together the above totals, we have the following result as to the gross money value of the fish purchased yearly in the London streets :

Wet fish	£1,177,200
Dry fish	127,000
Shell fish	156,650
Total	£1,460,850

"Hence we find that there is nearly a million and a half of money annually spent by the poorer classes of the metropolis in fish ; a sum so prodigious as almost to discredit every statement of want, even if the amount said to be so expended be believed. The returns from which the above account is made out have been obtained, however, from such unquestionable sources—not from one salesman alone, but checked and corrected by many gentlemen who can have no conceivable motive for exaggeration either one way or the other—that, sceptical as our utter ignorance of the subject must necessarily make us, still if we will but examine for ourselves, we shall find there is no gainsaying the facts.

"Moreover as to the enormity of the amount dispelling all ideas of privation among the industrious portion of the community, we shall also find on examination, that assuming the working-men of the metropolis to be 500,000 in number (the Occupation Abstract of 1841, gives 773,560 individuals following some employment in London, but these include merchants, employers, shopkeepers, Government-officers and others), and that they, with their wives and children, make up one million individuals, it follows that the sum per head, expended in fish by the poorer classes every week, is a fraction more than 6½d., or, in other words not quite one penny a day."—p. 78.

We have added Mr. Mayhew's explanation, or vindication of this fish-census, because it really requires something of the sort to make one swallow it. We should, however, have preferred an appeal *ad stomachum* rather than *ad crumenam* ; a division of the consumption amongst

mouths, rather than purses. Suppose a million of consumers, as he puts them; and distribute among them 263,300,000lbs (in round numbers) of wet fish, *plus* a million lbs of salt cod, *plus*, nearly five millions of smoked haddock, *plus*, seventy millions of herrings; and put the first of these at three million lbs, and the second at fourteen, as we find they average; we shall have the prodigious number of 281 million pounds of fish, to be consumed by a million of mouths; that is, each must eat 281lbs of fish a year, man, woman, and child: or over three quarters of a pound per day. We are not desirous of being captious; but we should like to see the statistics of this work rendered as accurate as possible. And if the above calculation appears incredible, what shall we say of the consumption, when we add to it the countless numbers of crustacea of every class, oceans full almost, which must make up several millions more of lbs devoured?

The above estimates would lead one to believe that the inhabitants of London ought to be classed among the nations of Ichthyophagi which occupy such large tracts of land in ancient maps, and figure in primæval histories. But when we consider the huge mountains of vegetables which they consume with their fish, we must conclude, that they season the productions of the deep, very copiously with the growth of terra firma. The following is Mr. Mayhew's table of vegetable consumption.

“GREEN FRUIT.

377,500 bushels of apples, at six a penny, or 4s. per bush.,	
(288 to the bushel.)	£75,500
193,700 bushels of pears, at 5s. per bushel,	48,400
1,215,360 lbs. of cherries, at 2d. per lb.	10,000
11,700 bushels of plums, at 1d. per half pint,	6,270
100 bushels of greengages, at 1½d. per half pint,	80
548 bushels of damsons, at 1½d. per half pint,	430
2,450 bushels of bullace, at 1½d. per half pint,	1,960
207,500 bushels of gooseberries, at 3d. per quart,	83,000
85,500 sieves of red currants, at 1d. per pint, (three half-sieves to the bushel.)	15,300
13,500 sieves of black currants, at 1d. per pint, (three half-sieves to the bushel.)	2,400
3,000 sieves of white currants, at 1d. per pint, (three half-sieves to the bushel)	530
763,750 pottles of strawberries, at 2d. per pottle,	6,360
1,760 pottles of raspberries, at 6d. per pottle,	40

30,485 pottles of mulberries, at 6 <i>d.</i> per pottle,	760
6,000 bushels of hazel nuts, at 4 <i>d.</i> per half pint, ...	2,400
17,280 lbs. of filberts, at 3 <i>d.</i> per lb.	200
26,563 lbs. of grapes, at 4 <i>d.</i> per lb.	440
20,000 pine apples, at 6 <i>d.</i> each,	500
15,400,000 oranges, at two for 1 <i>d.</i> ,	32,000
154,000 lemons, at two for 1 <i>d.</i>	320
24,000 bushels of Spanish and Barcelona nuts, at 6 <i>d.</i> per quart,	19,200
3,000 bushels of Brazil nuts, (1,500 to the bushel,) at fifteen for a penny	1,250
6,500 bushels of chestnuts, (1,500 to the bushel,) at fifteen for a penny,	2,700
24,000 bushels of walnuts, (1750 to the bushel,) at ten for a penny,	17,500
400,000 coker-nuts, at 3 <i>d.</i> each,	5,000

Total expended yearly in green fruit, £333,420

“ DRY FRUIT.

7,000 lbs. of shell almonds, at 20 a penny, (320 to the lb.)	460
37,800 lbs. of raisins, at 2 <i>d.</i> per lb.	300
24,300 lbs. of figs, at 2 <i>d.</i> per lb.	200
4,800 lbs. of prunes, at 2 <i>d.</i> per lb.	40

Total expended yearly on dry fruit, £1,000

“ VEGETABLES.

60,500,000 lbs. of potatoes, at 5 lbs. for 2 <i>d.</i>	100,800
23,760,000 cabbages, at 1 <i>d.</i> each,	49,500
3,264,800 turnips, at 1½ <i>d.</i> per doz.	1,700
601,000 carrots, at 2½ <i>d.</i> per doz.	520
567,300 brocoli and cauliflowers, at 1 <i>d.</i> per head, ...	2,360
616,666 junks of turnip tops, at 4 <i>d.</i> per junk,	10,270
219,000 bushels of peas, at 1 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per bushel,	16,420
8,890 bushels of beans, at 1 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per bushel,	660
22,110 bushels of French beans, at 6 <i>d.</i> per peck, or 2 <i>s.</i> per bushel,	2,210
25,608 vegetable marrows, at 1½ <i>d.</i> each,	50
489 dozen bundles of asparagus, at 2 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per bundle, (4 <i>d.</i> or 6 <i>d.</i> a doz. heads,)	730
9,120 dozen bundles of rhubarb, at 2 <i>s.</i> 6 <i>d.</i> per doz. ..	1,140
4,350 dozen bundles of celery, at 3 <i>d.</i> per bundle, ...	650
561,602 lettuces, at 3 a penny	780
13,291 dozen hands of radishes, at 3 bunches for a penny, and 6 bunches to the hand,	1,330
499,530 bushels of onions, at 4 <i>s.</i> per bushel,	99,900

10,920 bushels of cucumbers, at 1d. each, (60 to the bush.)	2,730
3,290 dozen bundles of herbs, at 3d. a bundle,	490

Total expended yearly in vegetables, £292,240

"Putting the above sums together we have the following aggregate result:—

Expended yearly in green fruit,	£333,420
Expended yearly in dry fruit,	1,000
Expended yearly in vegetables,	292,000

Gross sums taken annually by the London costermongers for fruit and vegetables, }	£626,420
---	----------

"Then adding the above to the gross amount received by the street-sellers of fish, which we have before seen comes to as much as £1,460,850, we have for the annual income of the London costermongers no less a sum than £2,087,270."—p. 95.

These two items, it would appear, make up the business of costermongering, properly so called. But we have by no means got to the end of the food provided by wandering merchants, for the daintier feeders among the poor. The following is the valuation, in number and cash, of the game annually consumed from the street.

	£
" 5,000 grouse, at 1s. 9d. each	437
20,000 partridges, at 1s. 6d.	1,500
12,000 pheasants, at 3s. 6d.	2,100
5,000 snipes, at 8d.	160
20,000 hares, at 2s. 3d.	2,250
600,000 rabbits, at 7d.	17,500
500,000 fowls, at 1s. 6d.	37,500
20,000 geese, at 2s. 6d.	2,500
80,000 ducks, at 1s. 6d.	6,000
30,000 turkeys, at 3s. 6d.	5,250
10,000 live fowls and ducks, at 1s. 6d.	750
	£75,953 "

There is another dainty which must not be omitted. After an interesting account of the "industry" of preparing sheeps' trotters in one particular *fabrique*, our author gives the following result.

"In this establishment are prepared, weekly, 20,000 sets, or 80,000 feet; a yearly average of 4,160,000 trotters, or the feet of

1,040,000 sheep. Of this quantity the street-folk buy seven-eighths; 3,640,000 trotters yearly, or 70,000 weekly. The number of sheep-trotter-sellers may be taken at 300, which gives an average of nearly sixty sets a week per individual.

"The wholesale price, at the 'trotter-yard,' is five a penny, which gives an outlay by the street-sellers of 3,031*l.* 11*s.* yearly."—p. 171.

This is not, like substances, animal or vegetable, previously enumerated, a raw material; but one ready cooked. This brings us to another department of street-trading; the prepared food. We will not enter into it at length: but content ourselves with stating, that the amount spent annually in the streets, on food chiefly of a toothsome nature, is £203,115. In this list, ginger-beer figures at £14,660, tea and coffee at £31,200, pies at £3000, gingerbread-nuts a £6,630, and sweet stuff, at £10,000 *per an.* But there is one item in the list which gives the result a false colouring; and we must give it in the book's own words, lest we should be thought tripping.

"*Street-sellers of Cats' and Dogs' Meat.*—There are 300,000 cats in the metropolis, and from 900 to 1,000 horses, averaging 2 cwt. of meat each, boiled down every week; the quantity of cats' and dogs' meat used throughout London is about 200,000 lbs. per week, and this sold at the rate of 2½*d.* per lb., gives 2,000*l.* a week for the money spent in cats' and dogs' meat, or per year, upwards of £100,000."—p. 211.

However attached the dog may be to man, or the cat to the fire-side, it is too bad to add their quadrupedal food to that consumed by their masters. But what an item! And some perhaps will be inclined to add, what a waste! How many poor might be supported on what now goes literally to the dogs! But this would be a wrong view of the matter. For after all, old horses must die; and dead, must be disposed of. Now the very carrying round of this animal food gives employment to one thousand persons, who make a profit of £50 *per annum* out of it; in other words, there are £50,000 go to industrious poor people out of dead horse-flesh. Then when we consider the number of cooks, and other officers required to dress a thousand horses a week, at the canine and feline symposiums, we may be satisfied that this is a useful source of occupation to many who would otherwise be unemployed. Before, however, leaving this unsavoury subject, we must add that

the account given us by Mr. Mayhew, of our English equine abattoirs (p. 183), if complete, shows us to be much behind our French neighbours, in the same branch of industry, as described by Mr. Babbage, in his "Economy of manufactures." There we find, that twelve different sources of profit are found in the deceased charger; the last being the most ingenious—the sale to the furriers of the skins of rats attracted by the slaughter-house. In one room of the establishment, 16,000 of these vermin were killed in four weeks, without any sensible diminution of numbers; and their skins being valued at 3s. per hundred, an average is allotted, in the table of profits, of 1s. 6d. to each horse.*

We must now turn to something more refreshing: from the slaughter-house we will bend our steps towards the green fields, and pleasant gardens; and conclude this part of our subject, by what cannot fail to impart a favourable impression respecting the tastes of the poor. We allude to that love of flowers and plants, which, strangely enough, is more sensible in northern, and ruder, than in more genial, climates. It is true, however, that, the perambulatory gardener has one advantage. It is not merely the poor clerk or needlewoman, who nurses the sickly little plant in the garret window, that patronises him: but the lady in the suburban cottage, who has a flower-stand in her window, and her lord, who has retired from business, or comes home from it, to enjoy his rural occupations in a twelve feet square front-garden, collect their growing stock from his barrow. But these are not considered his best customers, as appears from the following.

"The customers for trees and shrubs are generally those who inhabit the larger sort of houses, where there is room in the hall or the windows for display; or where there is a garden capacious enough for the implantation of the shrubs. Three-fourths of the trees are sold on a round, and when purchased at a stall, the costermonger generally undertakes to deliver them at the purchaser's residence, if not too much out of his way, in his regular rounds. Or he may diverge, and make a round on speculation, purposely. There is as much bartering trees for old clothes, as for roots, and as many, or more complaints of the hard bargainings of

* P. 396, fourth ed. The profits of this trade seem much greater in France, by this account.

ladies : 'I'd rather sell polyanthuses at a farthing a piece profit to poor women, if I could get no more,' said one man, 'than I'd work among them screws that's so fine in grand caps and so civil. They'd skin a flea for his hide and tallow.'—p. 134.

We will now place before our reader, the general table of flowers and shrubs, purchased in the streets; and he will agree with us, no doubt, that the taste which it exhibits is one of those good symptoms that we eagerly seize upon, in prognosticating well or ill of the condition of the poor.

"CUT FLOWERS.

<i>Bunches of</i>	<i>per bunch</i>	
65,280 Violets ...	at $\frac{1}{2}d.$...	£136
115,200 Wallflowers	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	240
86,400 Mignonette	1d. ...	360
1,632 Lilies of the Valley	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	3
20,448 Stocks ..	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	42
316,800 Pinks and Carnations	$\frac{1}{2}d.$ each	660
864,000 Moss Roses	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	1,800
864,000 China ditto	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	1,800
296,640 Lavender ...	1d. ...	1,236
Total annually		£6,277

"FLOWER ROOTS.

	<i>per root</i>	
24,000 Primroses	at $\frac{1}{2}d.$...	50
34,560 Polyanthuses	1d. ..	144
28,800 Cowslips ...	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	50
33,600 Daisies ..	1d. ...	140
46,080 Wallflowers	1d. ...	192
28,800 Candy-tufts	1d. ...	120
28,800 Daffodils	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	60
38,400 Violets	$\frac{1}{2}d.$..	80
30,380 Mignonette	$\frac{1}{2}d.$...	63
23,040 Stocks ...	1d. ...	96
19,200 Pinks and Carnations	2d. ...	160
3,456 Lilies of the Valley,	1d. ...	14
12,960 Pansies	1d. ...	54
660 Lilies ...	2d. ...	5
850 Tulips ...	2d. ...	7
7,704 Balsams ...	2d. ...	64
3,180 Calceolarias ...	2d. ...	26
253,440 Musk Plants	1d. ..	1,056

11,520 London Pride	1d.	...	48
25,595 Lupins	...	1d.	106
9,156 China-asters	...	1d.	38
63,360 Marigolds	...	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.	132
852 Dahlias	...	6d.	21
13,356 Heliotropes	...	2d.	111
1,920 Poppies	...	2d.	16
6,912 Michaelmas Daisies	...	$\frac{1}{2}$ d.	14

Total annually £2,867

"BRANCHES.

<i>Bunches of</i>		<i>per bunch</i>	
59,040 Holly	...	at 3d.	£738
56,160 Mistletoe	..	3d.	702
26,640 Ivy and Laurel	...	3d.	333
5,400 Lilac	...	3d.	67
1,008 Palm	..	3d.	12
2,520 May	...	3d.	31

Total annually from Markets, £1,183

Add one-half as shown,* 591

£2,774

"TREES AND SHRUBS.

9,576 Firs (roots)	each root	at 3d.	...	£119
1,152 Laurels	...	3d.	..	14
23,040 Myrtles	...	4d.	...	384
2,160 Rhododendrons	...	9d.	...	81
2,304 Lilacs	...	4d.	...	38
2,880 Box	...	2d.	...	24
21,888 Heaths	..	4d.	...	364
2,880 Broom	...	1d.	...	12
6,912 Furze	...	1d.	...	28
6,480 Laurustinus	...	8d.	..	216
25,920 Southernwood	...	1d.	...	108

Total annually spent £1,388

"FLOWERS IN POTS.

			<i>per pot</i>	
38,880	Moss Roses	...	at 4d.	... £648
38,880	China Roses	...	2d.	... 324
38,800	Fuschias	...	3d.	... 485
12,850	Geraniums and Pelargoniums	}	3d.	... 210
	(of all kinds)			
			Total annually,	£1,667

* Cut from hedges, gardens, &c., with, or without, leave.

"The returns give the following aggregate amount of street expenditure:—

	£.
" Trees and shrubs	1,388
Cut Flowers	6,277
Flowers in pots	1,667
Flower roots	2,867
Branches	2,774
Seeds	200

£15,173"—p. 139.

Before leaving the vegetable world, we must not overlook other sorts of "green stuff," which, in our work, are classed rather incongruously together. To the vegetables bought in the streets must be added the following.

" 6,696,450 bunches of water-cresses, at ½d. per bunch	} £13,949
5,616,000 " groundsel, at ½d	11,700
1,120,800 " chickweed and plantain	2,335
360,000 turfs, at 2½d. per doz.	520

28,504"—p. 158.

Here again we must enter our protest against the foods of the plumed, and the implumed, bipeds being united. But here is certainly another of those extraordinary facts, which make us know the immensity of London. What the amount of canary-seed, or rape-seed, or other ordinary and daily "bread-stuffs" of little birds annually consumed in London may be, we have no returns before us to show. But it is almost frightful to think, that the extra, spring, food, of these little extravagant creatures costs London, £14,000 *per annum*. There is, or was, when such innocent things were permitted, in the good old days of monarchy, from *le bon roi Dagobert* downwards, a riddle in France, conceived as follows; "Quelle est la femme la plus sensible de Paris?" To which, when duly given up, the answer was, "Celle qui crie, 'mouron (mourrons) pour les petits oiseaux:.'" "Groundsell for little birds." But £14,000 a-year for such a commodity is really no joke; and may well excite our sensibilities.

Hitherto we have sought to convey an idea of the immensity of laborious poverty which exists in the capital city of our empire. It is only by entering into some detail

that this could be duly represented. But now we have to enter on the social question, and ascertain what apprehension, and what hopes may justly be entertained, in consequence of this state of things. The question resolves itself into this: what is the moral condition of this multitude? The 30,000 people, who form an industrial class among the poor, better off than many thousands more, that have no employment, who are in constant contact with many other thousands on whose dealings with them they live, may well form a type, and give a test by which we may judge of the great mass of our poorer population, whether it be good or evil. Different persons will apply this test in different ways, according to the diversity of their views and opinions. Some would enquire whether this trafficking class were honest or not; and would be satisfied if the first could be affirmed. Others would desire to learn, what is their domestic morality, their idea of family ties and obligations; and be content if here all was sound. A third party would investigate, how they feel as to social duties, submission to authority, love of order, confidence in public justice; and deem all safe, if these guarantees of outward morals were secured. Finally, many, with ourselves, would look upon this as the primary and fundamental enquiry, what religious principle, what faith, what spiritual aids, what future and higher hopes, this class hold and cling to, and practically cultivate. But under whatever aspect one's principles lead one to view and judge the state of the poor, all and one are destined to receive, from Mr. Mayhew's book, a most appalling lesson of disappointed hopes.

As to the honesty of the street-traders, we fear there is not much to be said in its favour. It is pretty well confined to their dealings with one another: and as far as Mr. Mayhew's brief statement on this matter informs us, (p. 26) the code of honesty may be reduced to the following heads; first, Costers never steal from one another; second, their boys only cheat, but never rob their employers; third, all the rest is fair game. As to those from whom they buy, and who may be supposed to know them, we are told, "the salesmen, at the several markets, all agreed in stating, that no trust was given to the costermongers. 'Trust them,' exclaimed one, 'O certainly, as far as I can see them.'" (p. 5.) As to those who buy from them, it behoves them to keep a sharp look out. We well remember

the indignation of an aged friend of ours, who bought a pottle of fine-looking strawberries in the street, for a shilling; and, after taking off the top rows, found two chips across the pottle, which had stopped all further descent of the fruit. One habit of this race is essentially opposed to honesty; the inveterate and incorrigible vice of gambling. It is their great recreation, and their Sunday is spent in continuous hours, upon this corrupting pastime. Again, they see others act upon the most dishonest principles in their regard; they are made to pay exorbitant rates of interest for small sums advanced as capital, and rack-rents for whatever they borrow as implements of trade. This puts their ingenuity on the stretch to compensate for these extortions; and, like the nomads of the East, as they think every man's hand is against them, so is theirs against all men.

It is pleasing, however, to see how confidence begets confidence. Mr. Mayhew gives remarkable instances (to which we could add others, come to our knowledge), of the punctuality with which sums advanced to the industrious poor are honestly repaid. But one illustration we must introduce, not only because most interesting in itself, but because it has been confirmed to us, by the excellent, and in our eyes, most distinguished, lady, mentioned in it. It is as follows:

"Those who are unacquainted with the character of the people may feel inclined to doubt the trustworthiness of the class, but it is an extraordinary fact that but few of the costermongers fail to repay the money advanced to them, even at the present ruinous rate of interest. The poor, it is my belief, have not yet been sufficiently tried in this respect;—pawnbrokers, loan-offices, tally-shops, dolly-shops, are the only parties who will trust them—but, as a startling proof of the good faith of the humbler classes generally, it may be stated that Mrs. Chisholm (the lady who has exerted herself so benevolently in the cause of emigration) has lent out, at different times, as much as £160,000, that has been entrusted to her for the use of the 'lower orders,' and that the whole of this large amount has been returned—with the exception of £12!

"I myself have often given a sovereign to professed thieves to get 'changed,' and never knew one to make off with the money. Depend upon it, if we would really improve, we must begin by elevating instead of degrading."—p. 32.

If from the honesty of the street-merchants, we turn to the contemplation of their morality, in what regards

domestic relations, and the virtues springing from them, we have presented to us a frightful picture indeed. This class are almost driven to amusements of so low, degrading, and immoral a cast, that we cannot be surprised to find the very first germs of modesty plucked from the breast, before they have reached maturity, and all the frightful immorality, to which that virtue serves as a bulwark, ripened into vice, before principle or judgment is strong enough to check it. As gambling is the out-of-doors recreation of the costermonger race, so is the "penny gaff," or theatre, their evening in-doors amusement. The entertainment of these sinks of iniquity consists in, either loosely disguised, or barefaced, immorality; and the crowds of children and youth of both sexes who flock to them, if not already corrupted, must suck in a soul-destroying poison there. But the account given by Mr. Mayhew of these places of resort is too accurate in its horrid details, to be transferred to our pages. He has some very appropriate reflections, however, upon the importance of providing the poor with innocent, rational, and improving amusement.

This subject opens to us a wide and interesting field. In a former review of Lord John Manner's pamphlet on "National holydays," we had occasion to make observations on the subject; and we have only been confirmed in our views, by all that we have subsequently seen or heard. In spite of the turned-up eyes of fanatics, or the sneering frown of puritans, we are sure that the religion of the country has much to answer for, in the immorality of the poor. There is not to be found in Italy, or Spain, or any Catholic country, a mass of population so degraded as that described in this work. Religion ought to work upon the senses, and give them, as well as the soul, or rather, the soul through them, their truest and most wholesome gratification. The Oratorio, for instance, will supply genuine and beautiful music, where it can be established, interspersed with sound instruction. Processions, paintings, functions, in or about the poorest parish Church, where the poor have all the "getting up" in their own hands, and in which they have a share and interest, supply the place of court pageants, or lordly entertainments, which the rich find so necessary for their own enjoyment of life. Whatever pleasure religion gave, or can give, to eye or ear, has been withdrawn from the destitute classes; they

cannot afford that which is provided for the rich : and therefore they are left by society with one of these supposed alternatives : either that they can do perfectly without what society itself considers necessary ; or that, untutored, undirected, unaided, they will be sure to provide themselves with what is virtuous and improving.

For some years it has been thought feasible to attain the same purpose by other means. The age prides itself on being, and making all, intellectual. It has, therefore, been thought, that, while the educated classes are scarcely fit in the evening, after a day's idleness, for anything but a ball or the opera, a mechanic or labourer, who has been toiling, in the sweat of his brow, from sunrise to sunset, and perhaps more, is exactly in right trim to go read mathematics or chemistry. Mechanics' Institutes became the rage, and every other sort of contrivance to overtax the brain, when nature called for repose, or, what we have no adequate English word for, *delassement*. For our parts, we are *obscurantists* enough to believe, that a walk in the green fields, or a cheerful recreation of a moral character, would produce a better race than the overload of ill-balanced learning upon a time-worn vehicle, not prepared to receive it. And, moreover, the mind goes off by a rebound, to seek compensation in diseased literature, for the heavy task-work of inapplicable science. We say not a word of the knowledge which puffeth up, nor of the sceptical tendency of such science, where there is no faith to counteract it.

We have wandered widely from our author, and yet have not said half what we wished. We must let Mr. Mayhew speak on the morality of his friends, the costers of London, for he really is their last friend, and feels for them. He will confirm our darkest views. Take the following.

"The fate of children brought up amid the influence of such scenes—with parents starving one week and drunk all the next—turned loose into the streets as soon as they are old enough to run alone—sent out to sell in public-houses almost before they know how to put two halfpence together—their tastes trained to libidinisism long before puberty at the penny concert, and their passions inflamed with the unrestrained intercourse of the twopenny hops—the fate of the young, I say, abandoned to the blight of such associations as these, cannot well be otherwise than it is. If the child be father to the man, assuredly it does not require a great effort of

imagination to conceive the manhood that such a childhood must necessarily engender."—p. 101.

Such is the seed sown in youth; we may, indeed, easily anticipate the harvest. The following presents us with the state of marriage in this class of our population.

"Only one-tenth—at the outside one-tenth—of the couples living together and carrying on the costermongering trade, are married. In Clerkenwell parish, however, where the number of married couples is about a fifth of the whole, this difference is easily accounted for, as in Advent and Easter the incumbent of that parish marries poor couples without a fee. Of the rights of 'legitimate or illegitimate children the costermongers understand nothing, and account it a mere waste of money and time to go through the ceremony of wedlock when a pair can live together, and be quite as well regarded by their fellows, without it. The married women associate with the unmarried mothers of families without the slightest scruple. There is no honour attached to the marriage state, and no shame to concubinage. Neither are the unmarried women less faithful to their 'partners' than the married; but I understand that, of the two classes, the unmarried betray the most jealousy.

"As regards the fidelity of these women I was assured that, 'in anything like good times,' they were rigidly faithful to their husbands or paramours; but that, in the worst pinch of poverty, a departure from this fidelity—if it provided a few meals or a fire—was not considered at all heinous."—p. 20.

We will only give our readers one more extract on this painful subject.

"The costermongers, taken as a body, entertained the most imperfect idea of the sanctity of marriage. To their undeveloped minds it merely consists in the fact of a man and woman living together, and sharing the gains they may each earn by selling in the street. The father and mother of the girl look upon it as a convenient means of shifting the support of their child over to another's exertions; and so thoroughly do they believe this to be the end and aim of matrimony, that the expense of a church ceremony is considered as a useless waste of money, and the new pair are received by their companions as cordially as if every form of law and religion had been complied with.

"The notions of morality among these people agree strangely, as I have said, with those of many savage tribes—indeed, it would be curious if it were otherwise. They are a part of the Nomades of England, neither knowing nor caring for the enjoyments of home. The hearth, which is so sacred a symbol to all civilized races as being the spot where the virtues of each succeeding generation are

taught and encouraged, has no charms to them. The tap-room is the father's chief abiding place; whilst to the mother the house is only a better kind of *tent*. She is away at the stall, or hawking her goods from morning till night, while the children are left to play away the day in the court or alley, and pick their morals out of the gutter. So long as the limbs gain strength the parent cares for nothing else. As the young ones grow up, their only notions of wrong are formed by what the policeman will permit them to do. If we, who have known from babyhood the kindly influences of a home, require, before we are thrust out into the world to get a living for ourselves, that our perceptions of good and evil should be quickened and brightened (the same as our perceptions of truth and falsity) by the experience and counsel of those who are wiser and better than ourselves,—if, indeed, it needed a special creation and example to teach the best and strongest of us the law of right, how bitterly must the children of the street-folk require tuition, training, and advice, when from their very cradles (if, indeed, they ever knew such luxuries) they are doomed to witness in their parents, whom they naturally believe to be their superiors, habits of life in which passion is the sole rule of action, and where every appetite of our animal nature is indulged in without the least restraint.

"I say thus much because I am anxious to make others feel, as I do myself, that *we* are the culpable parties in these matters. That they poor things should do as they do is but human nature—but that *we* should allow them to remain thus destitute of every blessing vouchsafed to ourselves—that we should willingly share what we enjoy with our brethren at the Antipodes, and yet leave those who are nearer and who, therefore, should be dearer to us, to want even the commonest moral necessities is a paradox that gives to the zeal of our Christianity a strong savour of the chicanery of Cant.

"The costermongers strongly resemble the North American Indians in their conduct to their wives. They can understand that it is the duty of the woman to contribute to the happiness of the man, but cannot feel that there is a reciprocal duty from the man to the woman. The wife is considered as an inexpensive servant, and the disobedience of a wish is punished with blows. She must work early and late, and to the husband must be given the proceeds of her labour. Often when the man is in one of his drunken fits—which sometimes lasts two or three days continuously—she must by her sole exertions find food for herself and him too. To live in peace with him, there must be no murmuring, no tiring under work, no fancied cause for jealousy—for if there be, she is either beaten into submission or cast adrift to begin life again—as another's leavings."—p. 43.

We must therefore conclude, that it is not to moral

principles that we must look for any support of the fabric of society, when the poor may be tempted to take its pillars in their hands, and try, like the blind toiler at the Philistine mill, whether strength suffices for revenge. But perhaps our hopes may lie in the quiet with which police regulations are obeyed, and the unlikelihood of politics troubling the heads of these sturdy merchants of the streets. When, however, we symbolised them under the form of the irritated captive, recovering consciousness of long dormant might, we had this thought before us. These people are, unhappily, nursing a sense of wrong and of oppression, for total neglect wears often this appearance. They are brought up in the lowest school of chartist or socialist politics, and the hatred of police is instinctive to them. This part of our subject, as most important for studying the possible future in the certain present, we will illustrate, by extracts, which have a painful drollery intermingled with grave matter of thought, that will prevent their being heavy, though long. To begin with their politics, let us see where they are picked up, and what feelings their course of reading inspires.

"It may appear anomalous to speak of the literature of an uneducated body, but even the costermongers have their tastes for books. They are very fond of hearing any one read aloud to them, and listen very attentively. One man often reads the Sunday paper of the beer-shop to them, and on a fine summer's evening a costermonger, or any neighbour who has the advantage of being 'a schollard,' reads aloud to them in the courts they inhabit. What they love best to listen to—and, indeed, what they are most eager for—are Reynolds's periodicals, especially the 'Mysteries of the Court.' 'They've got tired of Lloyd's blood-stained stories,' said one man, who was in the habit of reading to them, 'and I'm satisfied that, of all London, Reynolds is the most popular man among them. They stuck to him in Trafalgar-square, and would again. They all say he's 'a trump,' and Feargus O'Connor's another trump with them.'

"'The costermongers,' said my informant, 'are very fond of illustrations. I have known a man, what couldn't read, buy a periodical what had an illustration, a little out of the common way perhaps, just that he might learn from some one, who could read, what it was all about. They have all heard of Cruikshank, and they think everything funny is by him—funny scenes in a play and all. His 'Bottle' was very much admired. I heard one man say it was very prime, and showed what 'lush' did, but I saw the same man,' added my informant, 'drunk three hours afterwards. Look you here, sir,' he continued, turning over a periodical, for he had the number with him, 'here's a portrait of

Catherine of Russia.' 'Tell us all about her,' said one man to me last night; read it; what was she?' 'When I had read it,' my informant continued, 'another man, to whom I showed it, said, 'Don't the cove as did that know a deal?' for they fancy—at least, a many do—that one man writes a whole periodical, or a whole newspaper. Now here,' proceeded my friend, 'you see's an engraving of a man hung up, burning over a fire, and some costers would go mad if they couldn't learn what he'd been doing, who he was, and all about him. 'But about the picture?' they would say, and this is a very common question put by them whenever they see an engraving.

" 'Here's one of the passages that took their fancy wonderfully,' my informant observed :

" 'With glowing cheeks, flashing eyes, and palpitating bosom, Venetia Trelawney rushed back into the refreshment-room, where she threw herself into one of the arm-chairs already noticed. But scarcely had she thus sunk down upon the flocculent cushion, when a sharp click, as of some mechanism giving way, met her ears; and at the same instant her wrists were caught in manacles which sprang out of the arms of the treacherous chair, while two steel bands started from the richly carved back and grasped her shoulders. A shriek burst from her lips—she struggled violently, but all to no purpose : for she was a captive—and powerless !

" 'We should observe that the manacles and the steel bands which had thus fastened upon her, were covered with velvet, so that they inflicted no positive injury upon her, nor even produced the slightest abrasion of her fair and polished skin.'

" 'Here all my audience,' said the man to me, 'broke out with—Aye! that's the way the harristocrats hooks it. There's nothing o' that sort among us ; the rich has all that barrikin to themselves. 'Yes, that's the way the taxes goes in,' shouted a woman.

" 'Anything about the police sets them a talking at once. This did when I read it :

" 'The Ebenezers still continued their fierce struggle, and, from the noise they made, seemed as if they were tearing each other to pieces, to the wild roar of a chorus of profane swearing. The alarm, as Bloomfield had predicted, was soon raised, and some two or three policemen, with their bulls-eyes, and still more effective truncheons, speedily restored order.'

" 'The blessed crushers is everywhere,' shouted one. 'I wish I'd been there to have had a shy at the eslops,' said another. And then a man sung out : 'O don't I like the Bobbys?'"—p. 251.

It appears, from this statement, which we see no reason to doubt, that the literature in vogue among this large class in London, and we may justly conjecture, through its allied or cognate races, is of the most dangerous character, and calculated to introduce or diffuse among them, a spirit of disaffection, combination, and anarch-

ism. But another extract, which treats professedly of the "politics of costermongers," and of "policemen," will give more definite information on the subject.

"THE POLITICS OF COSTERMONGERS.—POLICEMEN.

"The notion of the police is so intimately blended with what may be called the politics of the costermongers that I give them together.

"The politics of these people are detailed in a few words—they are nearly all Chartists. 'You might say, sir,' remarked one of my informants, 'that they *all* were Chartists, but as it's better you should rather be under than over the mark, say *nearly* all.' Their ignorance, and their being impulsive, makes them a dangerous class. I am assured that in every district where the costermongers are congregated, one or two of the body, more intelligent than the others, have great influence over them; and these leading men are all Chartists, and being industrious and not unprosperous persons, their pecuniary and intellectual superiority cause them to be regarded as oracles. One of these men said to me: 'The costers think that working-men know best, and so they have confidence in us. I like to make men discontented, and I will make them discontented while the present system continues, because it's all for the middle and the moneyed classes, and nothing, in the way of rights, for the poor. People fancy when all's quiet that all's stagnating. Propagandism is going on for all that. It's when all's quiet that the seeds are growing. Republicans and Socialists are pressing their doctrines.'

"The costermongers have very vague notions of an aristocracy; they call the more prosperous of their own body 'aristocrats.' Their notions of an aristocracy of birth or wealth seem to be formed on their opinion of the rich, or reputed rich salesmen with whom they deal; and the result is anything but favourable to the nobility.

"Concerning free-trade, nothing, I am told, can check the costermonger's fervour for a cheap loaf. A Chartist costermonger told me that he knew numbers of costers who were keen Chartists without understanding anything about the six points.

"The costermongers frequently attend political meetings, going there in bodies of from six to twelve. Some of them, I learned, could not understand why Chartist leaders exhorted them to peace and quietness, when they might as well fight it out with the police at once. The costers boast, moreover, that they stick more together in any 'row' than any other class. It is considered by them a reflection on the character of the thieves that they are seldom true to one another.

"It is a matter of marvel to many of this class that people can live without working. The ignorant costers have no knowledge of

'property,' or 'income,' and conclude that the non-workers all live out of the taxes. Of the taxes generally they judge from their knowledge that tobacco, which they account a necessary of life, pays 3s. per lb. duty.

"As regards the police, the hatred of a costermonger to a 'peeler' is intense, and with their opinion of the police, all the more ignorant unite that of the governing power. 'Can you wonder at it, sir,' said a costermonger to me, 'that I hate the police? They drive us about, we must move on, we can't stand here, and we can't pitch there. But if we're cracked up, that is if we're forced to go into the Union (I've known it both at Clerkenwell and the City of London workhouses), why the parish gives us money to buy a barrow, or a shallow, or to hire them, and leave the house and start for ourselves: and what's the use of that, if the police won't let us sell our goods?—Which is right, the parish or the police?'

"To thwart the police in any measure the costermongers readily aid one another. One very common procedure, if the policeman has seized a barrow, is to whip off a wheel, while the officers have gone for assistance; for a large and loaded barrow requires two men to convey it to the green-yard. This is done with great dexterity; and the next step is to dispose of the stock to any passing costers, or to any 'standing' in the neighbourhood, and it is honestly accounted for. The policemen, on their return, find an empty and unwheelable barrow, which they must carry off by main strength, amid the jeers of the populace.

"I am assured that in case of a political riot every 'coster' would seize his policeman."—p. 20.

"To serve out a policeman is the bravest act by which a costermonger can distinguish himself. Some lads have been imprisoned upwards of a dozen times for this offence; and are consequently looked upon by their companions as martyrs. When they leave prison for such an act, a subscription is often got up for their benefit. In their continual warfare with the force, they resemble many savage nations, from the cunning and treachery they use. The lads endeavour to take the unsuspecting 'crusher' by surprise, and often crouch at the entrance of a court until a policeman passes, when a stone or a brick is hurled at him, and the youngster immediately disappears. Their love of revenge too, is extreme—their hatred being in no way mitigated by time; they will wait for months, following a policeman who has offended or wronged them, anxiously looking out for an opportunity of paying back the injury. One boy, I was told, vowed vengeance against a member of the force, and for six months never allowed the man to escape his notice. At length, one night, he saw the policeman in a row outside a public house, and running into the crowd kicked him savagely, shouting at the same time: 'Now, you —, I've got you at last.' When the boy heard that his persecutor was injured for life, his joy was very great, and he declared the twelve months' imprisonment he was sen-

tenced to for the offence to be 'dirt cheap.' The whole of the court where the lad resided sympathized with the boy, and vowed to a man that had he escaped, they would have subscribed a pad or two of dry herrings, to send him into the country until the affair had blown over, for he had shown himself a 'plucky one.'

"It is called 'plucky' to bear pain without complaining. To flinch from expected suffering is scorned, and he who does so is sneered at and told to wear a gown, as being more fit to be a woman. To show a disregard for pain, a lad, when without money, will say to his pal, 'Give us a penny, and you may have a punch at my nose.' They also delight in tattooing their chests and arms with anchors, and figures of different kinds. During the whole of this painful operation, the boy will not flinch, but laugh and joke with his admiring companions, as if perfectly at ease."—p. 16.

However lively and amusing these recitals may be, they certainly inspire one with uneasiness, and almost, dread for the future. It is clear that a lurking sense of wrong is, like a smouldering fire, eating more and more deeply into the joists and beams which cross the tower levels of our house; and though we can now repress the power to burst forth, into a flame, we are allowing the destructive power to gain strength; for, as we shall see, nothing is done to check its progress. If one day we find these long neglected masses issuing forth from their desolate or squalid homes, to make war on property, whom shall we have to thank, but those that knew not what was for their country's peace, in the days of merciful visitation? It is not wonderful, that this class, who know so little of their betters, as the world calls them, should not have any great confidence in their administration of law. Accordingly we are assured that no inducement will suffice to take one of this race into a police court, to get himself justice. He looks to his own hand to render him what he wants of it. It is Lynch-law with these men.

"I may add that a very intelligent man from whom I derived information, said to me concerning costermongers never going to law to recover money owing to them, nor indeed for any purpose: 'If any one steals anything from me—and that, as far as I know, never happened but once in ten years—and I catch him, I take it out of him on the spot. I give him a jolly good hiding and there's an end of it. I know very well, sir, that costers are ignorant men, but in my opinion' (laughing) 'our never going to law shows that in that point we are in advance of the aristocrats.'"—p. 31.

Mr. Mayhew gives us a little anecdote, which may well

illustrate the manner in which these poor people get their notions of law. But it is worth a great deal more, on other accounts. First, it is quite as pathetic as, and more simply genuine than, Sterne's "Dead Ass;" and secondly, it gives us a good trait of this class of people, whose dark side stands out so much more prominently before us, than their brighter aspect. We love therefore to give it, as it is.

"'It's all nonsense to call donkeys stupid,' said one costermonger to me; 'them's stupid that calls them so: they're sensible. Not long since I worked Guildford with my donkey-cart and a boy. Jack (the donkey) was slow and heavy in coming back, until we got in sight of the lights at Vauxhall-gate, and then he trotted on like one o'clock, he did indeed! just as if he smelt it was London besides seeing it, and knew he was at home. He had a famous appetite in the country, and the fresh grass did him good. I gave a country lad twopence to mind him in a green lane there. I wanted my own boy to do so, but he said 'I'll see you further first.' A London boy hates being by himself in a lone country part. He's afraid of being burked; he is indeed. One can't quarrel with a lad when he's away in the country; he's very useful. I feed my donkey well. I sometimes give him a carrot for a luxury, but carrots are dear now. He's fond of mashed potatoes, and has many a good mash when I can buy them at 4lb. a penny.'

"'There was a friend of mine,' said another man, 'had great trouble about his donkey a few months back. I saw part of it, and knew all about it. He was doing a little work on a Sunday morning at Wandsworth, and the poor thing fell down dead. He was very fond of his donkey and kind to it, and the donkey was very fond of him. He thought he wouldn't leave the poor creature he'd had a good while, and had been out with in all weathers, by the road side; so he dropped all notion of doing business, and with help got the poor dead thing into his cart: its head lolloping over the end of the cart, and its poor eyes staring at nothing. He thought he'd drag it home and bury it somewhere. It wasn't for the value he dragged it, for what's a dead donkey worth? There was a few persons about him, and they was all quiet and seemed sorry for the poor fellow and for his donkey; but the church-bells struck up, and up came a 'crusher,' and took the man up, and next day he was fined 10s., I can't exactly say for what. He never saw no more of the animal, and lost his stock as well as his donkey.'"
—p. 28.

We come at last to the principal point to be considered, in estimating the moral character of this peculiar race. There is only one power which can be expected to act on them, to soften, to engentle, to reform, and transform

them, and to pluck the dangerous, nay poisoned, weapon, as yet sheathed, from their side. Religion is the great tamer of man in his wildness, and in his sullenness; in the deserts, whether of sand, or of peopled cities. A natural question presents itself; what influence has religion over the hearts of this great family, and the lower ranges of proletarianism, in our metropolis? The question, however, connects itself with others: what has been done, what is being done, what can be done, to make religion acceptable to them, or powerful over them, or even known to them?

We read of wholesale building of churches in certain poor districts of London: and there exists what is called a Church, buttressed up by endless societies, for additional curates, scripture-readers, tract-issues, with charities of all sorts. This establishment professes to have the exclusive spiritual care of the population, and jealously resents any intramission of other labourers into the field, which it cultivates. We shall see how gloriously it accomplishes its mission, and what marvellous fruits it produces among the poor.

Let us start first with the confession of one of the fraternity, given in these words: "I never go to Church; I used to go when I was a little child at Sevenoaks. I suppose I was born somewhere thereabouts. I've forgot what the inside of a church is like. There's no costermongers ever go to church, except the rogues of them, that wants to appear good." It appears, in other words, that going to church is at once a sign of hypocrisy in the opinion of these poor creatures, and that the body of them never think of going inside a sacred edifice. That there should be brutish ignorance of religion in such people can be no wonder, though it is a wonder how they are left in their present condition, by those who claim responsibility for their salvation.

Let us now see a few illustrations of this ignorance in all that regards the first elements of religion. People may talk of the darkness of the poorer classes in Catholic countries: but we have never yet seen a traveller, who would venture to say, that he had met thousands in any large Catholic city, who had never heard of the creation, or of our blessed Lord. Now read the following extract; and say, can religious ignorance be more appalling?

"Only last night father was talking about religion. We often talks about religion. Father has told me that God made the world, and I've heerd him talk about the first man and woman as was made and lived—it must be more than a hundred years ago—but I don't like to speak on what I dont know. Father, too, has told me about our Saviour what was nailed on a cross to suffer for such poor people as we is. Father has told us, too, about his giving a great many poor people a penny loaf and a bit of fish each, which proves him to have been a very kind gentleman. The Ten Commandments was made by him, I've heerd say, and he performed them too among other miracles. Yes! this is part of what our Saviour tells us. We are to forgive everybody, and do nobody no injury. I don't think I could forgive an enemy if she injured me very much; I'm sure I don't know why I couldn't, unless it is that I'm poor, and never learnt to do it. If a gal stole my shawl and didn't return it back or give me the value on it, I couldn't forgive her; but if she told me she lost it off her back, I shouldn't be so hard on her. We poor gals ain't very religious, but we are better than the men. We all of us thank God for everything—even for a fine day; as for sprats, we always say they're God's blessing for the poor, and thinks it hard of the Lord Mayor not to let 'em come in afore the ninth of November, just because he wants to dine off them—which he always do. Yes, we knows for certain that they eats plenty of sprats at the Lord Mayor's 'blanket.' They say in the Bible that the world was made in six days: the beasts, the birds, the fish, and all—and sprats was among them in coorse. There was only one house at that time as was made, and that was the Ark for Adam and Eve and their family. It seems very wonderful indeed how all this world was done so quick. I should have thought that England alone would have took double the time; shouldn't you, sir? But then it says in the Bible, God Almighty's a just and true God, and in coorse time would be nothing to him. When a good person is dying, we says, 'The Lord has called upon him, and he must go,' but I can't think what it means, unless it is that an angel comes—like when we're a-dreaming—and tell the party he's wanted in heaven. I know where heaven is; it's above the clouds, and they're placed there to prevent us seeing into it. That's where all the good people go, but I'm afeerd,'—she continued solemnly—'there's very few costers among the angels—specially those as deceives poor gals.

"No, I don't think this world could well go on for ever. There's a great deal of ground in it, certainly, and it seems very strong at present; but they say there's to be a flood on the earth, and earthquakes, and that will destroy it. The earthquake ought to have took place some time ago, as people tells me, but I never heerd any more about it. If we cheats in the streets, I know we shan't go to Heaven; but it's very hard upon us, for if we didn't cheat we couldn't live, profits is so bad. It's the same with the shops, and I suppose the young men there won't go to Heaven neither; but if people wont give the money, both

costers and tradesmen must cheat, and that's very hard. Why, look at apples! customers want them for less than they cost us, and so we are forced to shove in bad ones as well as good ones; and if we're to suffer for that, it does seem to me dreadful cruel."—p. 46.

This was from the mouth of a female; in whom more religious sentiment may be expected. The following is more characteristic of the other sex.

"On a Sunday I goes out selling, and all I yarns I keeps. As for going to church, why, I can't afford it,—besides, to tell the truth, I don't like it well enough. Plays, too, ain't in my line much; I'd sooner go to a dance—its more livelier. The 'penny gaffs' is rather more in my style; the songs are out and out, and makes our gals laugh. The smuttier the better, I thinks; bless you! the gals likes it as much as we do. If we lads ever has a quarrel, why, we fights for it. If I was to let a cove off once, he'd do it again; but I never give a lad a chance, so long as I can get anigh him. I never heard about Christianity; but if a cove was to fetch me a lick of the head, I'd give it him again, whether he was a big 'un or a little 'un. I'd precious soon see an henemy of mine shot afore I'd forgive him,—where's the use? Do I understand what behaving to your neighbour is?—In coorse I do. If a feller as lives next me wanted a basket of mine as I wasn't using, why, he might have it; if I was working it though, I'd see him further! I can understand that all as lives in a court is neighbours; but as for policemen, they're nothing to me, and I should like to pay 'em all off well. No; I never heerd about this here creation you speak about. In coorse God Almighty made the world, and the poor bricklayers' labourers built the houses arterwards—that's *my* opinion; but I can't say, for I've never been in no schools, only always hard at work, and knows nothing about it. I have heerd a little about our Saviour,—they seem to say he were a goodish kind of a man; but if he says as how a cove's to forgive a feller as hits you, I should say he know'd nothing about it. In coorse the gals the lads goes and lives with thinks our walloping 'em very cruel of us, but we don't. Why don't we?—why, because we don't. Before father died, I used sometimes to say my prayers, but after that mother was too busy getting a living to mind about my praying. Yes, I knows!—in the Lord's prayer they says 'Forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive them as trespasses agin us.' It's a very good thing, in coorse, but no costers can't do it."—p. 39.

But the next passage, which we will present, contains a mixture of the ridiculous, which relieves the seriousness of our subject.

"Well, times is bad, sir," he said, 'but it's a deadish time. I don't do so well at present as in middlish times, I think. When I

served the Prince of Naples, not far from here, (I presume that he alluded to the Prince of Capua,) I did better, and times was better. That was five years ago, but I can't say to a year or two. He was a good customer, and was very fond of peaches. I used to sell them to him at 12s. the plasket, when they was new. The plasket held a dozen, and cost me 6s. at Covent-garden—sometimes more, but I didn't charge him more when they did. His footman was a black man, and a ignorant man quite, and his housekeeper was a English woman. He was the prince o' Naples, was my customer; but I don't know what he was like, for I never saw him. I've heard that he was the brother of the king of Naples. I can't say where Naples is, but if you was to ask at Euston-square, they'll tell you the fare there, and the time to go it in. It may be in France for anything I know, may Naples, or in Ireland. Why don't you ask at the square? I went to Croydon once by rail, and slept all the way without stirring, and so you may to Naples for anything I know. I never heard of the Pope being a neighbour of the king of Naples. Do you mean living next door to him? But I don't know nothing of the king of Naples only the prince. I don't know what the Pope is. Is he any trade? It's nothing to me, when he's no customer of mine. I have nothing to say about nobody that ain't no customers. My crabs is caught in the sea, in course. I gets them at Billingsgate. I never saw the sea, but it's salt-water, I know. I can't say whereabouts it lays. I believe it's in the hands of the Billingsgate salesmen—all of it? I've heard of shipwrecks at sea, caused by drowning, in course. I never heard that the Prince of Naples was ever at sea. I like to talk about him, he was such a customer when he lived near here.' (Here he repeated his account of the supply of peaches to his Royal Highness.) 'I never was in France, no, sir, never. I don't know the way. Do you think I could do better there? I never was in the Republic there. What's it like? Bonaparte? O, yes, I've heard of him. He was at Waterloo. I didn't know he'd been alive now in France, as you ask me about him. I don't think you're larking, sir. Did I hear of the French taking possession of Naples, and Bonaparte making his brother-in-law king? Well, I didn't, but it may be true, because I served the Prince of Naples, what was the brother of the king. I never heard whether the Prince was the king's older brother or his younger. I wish he may turn out his older, if there's property coming to him, as the oldest has the first turn, at least, so I've heard—first come, first served. I've worked the streets and the courts at all times. I've worked them by moonlight, but you couldn't see the moonlight where it was busy. I can't say how far the moon's off us. It's nothing to me, but I've seen it a good bit higher than St. Paul's. I don't know nothing about the sun. Why do you ask? It must be nearer than the moon, for it's warmer,—and if they're both fire, that shows it. It's like the tap-room grate and that bit of a gas-light, to compare the

two is. What was St. Paul's that the moon was above? A church, sir, so I've heard. I never was in a church. O, yes, I've heard of God; he made heaven and earth; I never heard of his making the sea; that's another thing, and you can best learn about that at Billingsgate. (He seemed to think that the sea was an appurtenance of Billingsgate.) Jesus Christ? Yes. I've heard of him. Our Redeemer? Well, I only wish I could redeem my Sunday togs from my uncle's.'

"Another costermonger, in answer to enquiries, said: 'I 'spose you think us 'riginal coves that you ask. We're not like Methusalem, or some such swell's name, (I presume that Malthus was meant,) as wanted to murder children afore they was born, as I once heard lectured about—we're nothing like that.'

"Another on being questioned, and on being told that the information was wanted for the press, replied: 'The press? I'll have nothing to say to it. We are oppressed enough already.'

"That a class numbering 30,000, should be permitted to remain in a state of almost brutish ignorance, is a national disgrace. If the London costers belong especially to the 'dangerous classes,' the danger of such a body is assuredly an evil of our own creation, for the gratitude of the poor creatures, to any one who seeks to give them the least knowledge, is almost pathetic."—p. 22.

The sentiment expressed at the conclusion of this passage has been more developed by our author in another place, and we think the expression of his feelings deserves to be recorded.

"We have now, in a measure, finished with the metropolitan costermongers. We have seen that the street-sellers of fish, fruit, and vegetables constitute a large proportion of the London population; the men, women, and children numbering at the least 30,000, and taking as much as £2,000,000 per annum. We have seen, moreover, that these are the principal purveyors of food to the poor, and that consequently they are as important a body of people as they are numerous. Of all classes they *should* be the most honest, since the poor, least of all, can afford to be cheated; and yet it has been shown, that the consciences of the London costermongers, generally speaking, are as little developed as their intellects; indeed the moral and religious state of these men is a foul disgrace to us, laughing to scorn our zeal for the 'propagation of the gospel in *foreign* parts,' and making our many societies for the civilization of savages on the other side of the globe appear like a 'delusion, a mockery, and a snare,' when we have so many people sunk in the lowest depths of barbarism round about our very homes. It is well to have Bishops of New Zealand when we have Christianized all our *own* heathen; but with 30,000 individuals, in merely *one* of our cities, utterly creedless, mindless, and principleless, surely it would look more like earnestness on our parts if we created Bishops of the

New Cut, and sent 'right reverend fathers' to watch over the 'cure of souls' in the Broadway and the Brill. If our sense of duty will not rouse us to do this, at least our regard for our own interests should teach us, that it is not safe to allow this vast dungheap of ignorance and vice to seethe and fust, breeding a social pestilence in the very heart of our land. That the costermongers belong essentially to the dangerous classes, none can doubt, and those who know a coster's hatred of a 'crusher,' will not hesitate to believe that they are, as they themselves confess, one and all ready, upon the least disturbance, to seize and disable their policeman."—p. 100.

Having seen how much Anglicanism, backed by the wealth of Plutus, has accomplished towards reforming those asserted by it to be committed to its charge, we have a right to enquire, whence is salvation to come to these unhappy and benighted creatures? Is there any other body to whom seems reserved this glorious mission, to convert to God, and moralize this huge population? This is to our minds the most important portion of our investigation; and Mr. Mayhew's evidence on the subject has every appearance of being disinterested. He is not a Catholic, yet here is his statement of the religious tendencies of the costermongers, as he had it from an intelligent member of their fraternity.

"RELIGION OF COSTERMONGERS.

"An intelligent and trustworthy man, until very recently actively engaged in costermongering, computed that not 3 in 100 costermongers had ever been in the interior of a church, or any place of worship, or knew what was meant by Christianity. The same person gave me the following account, which was confirmed by others :

"The costers have no religion at all, and very little notion, or none at all, of what religion or a future state is. Of all things they hate tracts. They hate them because the people leaving them never give them anything, and as they can't read the tract—not one in forty—they're vexed to be bothered with it. And really what is the use of giving people reading before you've taught them to read? Now, they respect the City Missionaries, because they read to them—and the costers will listen to reading when they don't understand it—and because they visit the sick, and sometimes give oranges and such like to them and the children. I've known a City Missionary buy a shilling's worth of oranges of a coster, and give them away to the sick and the children—most of them belonging to the costermongers—down the court, and that made him respected there. I think the City Missionaries have done good. But I'm satisfied that if the costers had to profess themselves of some reli-

gion to-morrow, they would all become Roman Catholics, every one of them. This is the reason:—London costers live very often in the same courts and streets as the poor Irish, and if the Irish are sick, be sure there comes to them the priest, the Sisters of Charity—they *are* good women—and some other ladies. Many a man that's not a Catholic, has rotted and died without any good person near him. Why, I lived a good while in Lambeth, and there wasn't one coster in 100, I'm satisfied, knew so much as the rector's name,—though Mr. Dalton's a very good man. But the reason I was telling you of, sir, is that the costers reckoned *that* religion's the best that gives the most in charity, and they think the Catholics do this. I'm not a Catholic myself, but I believe every word of the Bible, and have the greater belief that it's the word of God because it teaches democracy. The Irish in the courts get sadly chaffed by the others about their priests,—but they'll die for the priest. Religion is a regular puzzle to the costers. They see people come out of church and chapel, and as they're mostly well dressed, and there's very few of their own sort among the church-goers, the costers somehow mix up being religious with being respectable, and so they have a queer sort of feeling about it. It's a mystery to them. It's shocking when you come to think of it. They'll listen to any preacher that goes among them; and then a few will say—I've heard it often—'Ab—y fool, why don't he let people go to h—ll their own way?' There's another thing that makes the costers think so well of the Catholics. If a Catholic coster—there's only very few of them—is 'cracked up' (penniless), he's often started again, and the others have a notion that it's through some chapel-fund. I don't know whether it is so or not, but I know the cracked-up men are started again, if they're Catholics. It's still the stranger that the regular costermongers, who are nearly all Londoners, should have such respect for the Roman Catholics, when they have such a hatred for the Irish, whom they look upon as intruders and underminers.—'If a missionary came among us with plenty of money,' said another costermonger, 'he might make us all Christians or Turks, or anything he liked.' Neither the Latter-day Saints, nor any similar sect, have made converts among the costermongers."—p. 21.

We have seldom read anything that has so cheered and encouraged us as this passage. It alters our feelings entirely about these neglected classes, and we can see them, in our mind's eye, stretching forth their hands towards the Catholic Church, and crying out: "Come over and help us." It seems reserved for our clergy, and perhaps for some of the mendicant orders, to penetrate into this class, and win it over to the consolations of the true faith. But we must not omit one most important corro-

boration of these hopes, the contrast, presented by Mr. Mayhew, of the Catholics corresponding in class and occupation, to those hitherto described. And first, let us have an honest Irish woman's mind about the religion of the English family of costermongers :

" 'I was tould I'd do betther in London, and so, glory be to God! I have—perhaps I have. I knew, Mr. ———, he porthers at Covent Garden, and I made him out, and hilped him in any long distance of a job. As I'd been used to farrumin' I thought it good raison I should be a costermonger, as they call it here. I can read and write too. And some good Christian—the heavens light him to glory when he's gone!—I don't know who he was—advanced me 10s.—or he gave it me, so to spake, through Father ———,' (a Roman Catholic priest.) 'We earn what keeps the life in us. I don't go to markit, but buy of a fair dealin' man—so I count him—though he's harrud sometimes. I can't till how many Irishmen is in the thrade. There's many has been brought down to it by the famin' and the changes. I don't go much among the English street-dealers. They talk like haythens. I never miss mass on a Sunday, and they don't know what the blissed mass manes. I'm almost glad I have no childer, to see how they're raired here. Indeed, sir, they're not raired at all—they run wild. They haven't the fear of God or the saints. They'd hang a praste—glory be to God! they would.' "—p. 106.

And now let us secure a second great point, by Mr. Mayhew's testimony to the marvellous preservation, by the poor Irish female, of the darling virtue of the nation. It is as follows :

"Very few of these women (nor, indeed, of the men, though rather more of them than the women) can read, and they are mostly all wretchedly poor ; but the women present two characteristics which distinguish them from the London coster-women generally—they are chaste, and, unlike the 'coster-girls,' very seldom form any connection without the sanction of the marriage ceremony. They are, moreover, attentive to religious observances." —p. 104.

Where this is safe, we may consider all else secured. Our readers must now bear with a couple of long extracts which will conclude this part of our subject. The first contains the general information on

"THE RELIGION OF THE STREET-IRISH.

"Having now given a brief sketch as to how the Irish people have come to form so large a proportion of the London street-sellers, I shall proceed, as I did with the English costermongers, to furnish the reader with a short account of their religious, moral, intellectual, and physical

condition, so that he may be able to contrast the habits and circumstances of the one class with those of the other. First, of the religion of the Irish street-folk.

"Almost all the street-Irish are Roman Catholics. Of course I can but speak generally; but during my inquiry I met with only two who said they were Protestants, and when I came to converse with them, I found out that they were partly ignorant of, and partly indifferent to, any religion whatever. An Irish Protestant gentleman said to me: 'You may depend upon it, if ever you meet any of my poor countrymen who will not talk to you about religion, they either know or care nothing about it; for the religious spirit runs high in Ireland, and Protestants and Catholics are easily led to converse about their faith.'

"I found that *some* of the Irish Roman Catholics—but they had been for many years resident in England, and that among the poorest or vagrant class of the English—had become indifferent to their creed, and did not attend their chapels, unless at the great fasts or festivals, and this they did only occasionally. One old stall-keeper, who had been in London nearly thirty years, said to me: 'Ah! God knows, sir, I ought to attend mass every Sunday, but I haven't for a many years, barrin' Christmas-day and such times. But I'll thry and go more regular, plase God.' This man seemed to resent, as a sort of indignity, my question if he ever attended any other place of worship. 'Av coorse not!' was the reply.

"One Irishman, also a fruit-seller, with a well stocked barrow, and without the complaint of poverty common among his class, entered keenly into the subject of his religious faith when I introduced it. He was born in Ireland, but had been in England since he was five or six. He was a good-looking fresh-coloured man, of thirty or upwards, and could read and write well. He spoke without bitterness, though zealously enough. 'Perhaps, sir, you are a gentleman connected with the Protistant clergy,' he asked, 'or a missionary?' On my stating that I had no claim to either character, he resumed: 'Will, sir, it don't matther. All the worruld may know my religion, and I wish all the worruld was of my religion, and betther min in it than I am; I do, indeed. I'm a Roman Catholic, sir; ' [here he made the sign of the cross;] 'God be praised for it! O yis, I know all about Cardinal Wiseman. It's the will of God, I feel sure, that he's to be 'stablished here, and it's no use ribillin' against that. I've nothing to say against Protistants. I've heard it said, 'It's best to pray for them.' The street-people that call themselves Protistants are no religion at all at all. I serruve Protistant gentlemen and ladies too, and sometimes they talk to me kindly about religion. They're good custhomers, and I have no doubt good people. I can't say what their lot may be in another worruld for not being of the true faith. No, sir, I'll give no opinions—none.'

"This man gave me a clear account of his belief that the Blessed Virgin (he crossed himself repeatedly as he spoke) was the mother of our Lord Jesus Christ, and was a mediator with our Lord, who was God of

heaven and earth—of the duty of praying to the holy saints—of attending mass—('but the priest,' he said, 'won't exact too much of a poor man, either about that or about fasting')—of going to confession at Easter and Christmas times, at the least—of receiving the body of Christ, 'the rare prisince,' in the holy sacrament—of keeping all God's commandments—of purgatory being a purgation of sins—and of heaven and hell. I found the majority of those I spoke with, at least, as earnest in their faith, if they were not as well instructed in it as my informant who may be cited as an example of the better class of street-sellers.....

"As I was anxious to witness the religious zeal that characterizes these people, I obtained permission to follow one of the priests as he made his rounds among his flock. Everywhere the people ran out to meet him. He had just returned to them I found, and the news spread round, and women crowded to their door-steps, and came creeping up from the cellars through the trap doors, merely to curtsy to him. One old crone, as he passed, cried, 'You're a good father, Heaven comfort you,' and the boys playing about stood still to watch him. A lad in a man's tail-coat and a shirt collar that nearly covered in his head—like a paper round a bouquet—was fortunate enough to be noticed, and his eyes sparkled, as he touched his hair at each word he spoke in answer. At a conversation that took place between the priest and a woman who kept a dry fish-stall, the dame excused herself for not having been up to take tea 'with his rivirince's mother lately, for thrade had been so bisy, and night was the fullest time.' Even as the priest walked along the street, boys running at full speed would pull up to touch their hair, and the stall-women would rise from their baskets; while all noise—even a quarrel—ceased until he had passed by. Still there was no look of fear in the people. He called them all by their names, and asked after their families, and once or twice the 'father' was taken aside and held by the button while some point that required his advice was whispered in his ear.

"The religious fervour of the people whom I saw was intense. At one house that I entered, the woman set me marvelling at the strength of her zeal, by showing me how she contrived to have in her sitting-room a sanctuary to pray before every night and morning, and even in the day 'when she felt weary and lonesome. The room was rudely enough furnished, and the only decent table was covered with a new piece of varnished cloth; still before a rude print of our Saviour, there were placed two old plated candlesticks, pink, with the copper shining through; and here it was that she told her beads. In her bed-room, too, was a coloured engraving of 'the Blessed lady,' which she never passed without curtsying to.

"Of course, I detail these matters as mere facts, without desiring to offer any opinion here, either as to the benefit or otherwise of the creed in question. As I had shown how the English costermonger neither had nor knew any religion whatever, it became my duty to give the reader a view of the religion of the Irish street-

sellers. In order to be able to do so as truthfully as possible, I placed myself in communication with those parties who were in a position to give me the best information on the subject. The result is given above, in all the simplicity and impartiality of history."—p. 107.

Our next extract gives a touching case of a small, poor, and young, Catholic family, in this class, struggling with its trials, which we have reason to hope have found alleviation through the publication of their simple history. It is as follows :

“OF TWO ORPHAN FLOWER GIRLS.

“Of these girls the elder was fifteen and the younger eleven. Both were clad in old, but not torn, dark print frocks, hanging so closely, and yet so loosely, about them as to show the deficiency of under-clothing ; they wore old broken black chip bonnets. The older sister (or rather half-sister) had a pair of old worn-out shoes on her feet, the younger was barefoot, but trotted along, in a gait at once quick and feeble—as if the soles of her little feet were impervious, like horn, to the roughness of the road. The elder girl has a modest expression of countenance, with no pretensions to prettiness except in having tolerably good eyes. Her complexion was somewhat muddy, and her features somewhat pinched. The younger child has a round, chubby, and even rosy face, and quite a healthful look. Her portrait is here given.

“They lived in one of the streets near Drury-lane. They were inmates of a house, not let out as a lodging-house, in separate beds, but in rooms, and inhabited by street-sellers and street-labourers. The room they occupied was large, and one dim candle lighted it so insufficiently that it seemed to exaggerate the dimensions. The walls were bare and discoloured with damp. The furniture consisted of a crazy table and a few chairs, and in the centre of the room was an old four-post bedstead of the larger size. This bed was occupied nightly by the two sisters and their brother, a lad just turned thirteen. In a sort of recess in a corner of the room was the decency of an old curtain—or something equivalent, for I could hardly see in the dimness—and behind this was, I presume, the bed of the married couple. The three children paid 2s. a week for the room, the tenant an Irishman out of work paying 2s. 9d., but the furniture was his, and his wife aided the children in their trifle of washing, mended their clothes, where such a thing was possible, and such like. The husband was absent at the time of my visit, but the wife seemed of a better stamp, judging by her appearance, and by her refraining from any direct, or even indirect way of begging, as well as from the ‘Glory be to God!’ the heavens be your honour’s bed!’ or ‘it’s the truth I’m telling of you sir,’ that I so frequently meet with on similar visits.

"The elder girl said, in an English accent, not at all garrulously, but merely in answer to my questions: 'I sell flowers, sir; we live almost on flowers when they are to be got.' I sell, and so does my sister, all kinds, but it's very little use offering any that's not sweet. I think it's the sweetness as sells them. I sell primroses, when they're in, and violets, and wall-flowers, and stocks, and roses, of different sorts, and pinks, and carnations, and mixed flowers, and lilies of the valley, and green lavender, and mignonette (but that I do very seldom), and violets again at this time of the year, for we get them both in spring and winter.' [They are forced in hot-houses for winter sale, I may remark.] 'The best sale of all is, I think, moss-roses, young moss-roses. We do best of all on them. Primroses are good, for people say: 'Well, here's spring again to a certainty.' Gentlemen are our best customers. I've heard that they buy flowers to give to the ladies. Ladies have sometimes said: 'A penny, my poor girl, here's three-halfpence for the bunch.' Or they've given me the price of two bunches for one; so have gentlemen. I never had a rude word said to me by a gentleman in my life. No, sir, neither lady nor gentleman ever gave me sixpence for a bunch of flowers. I never had a sixpence given to me in my life—never. I never go among boys. I know nobody but my brother. My father was a tradesman in Mitchel's Town, in the County Cork.....Mother died seven years ago last Guy Faux day. I've got myself, and my brother and sister a bit of bread ever since, and never had any help but from the neighbours. I never troubled the parish. O, yes, sir, the neighbours is all poor people, very poor, some of them. We've lived with her' (indicating her landlady by a gesture) 'these two years, and off and on before that. I can't say how long.' 'Well, I don't know exactly, said the landlady, 'but I've had them with me almost all the time for four years, as near as I can recollect; perhaps more. I've moved three times, and they always followed me.' In answer to my inquiries the landlady assured me that these two poor girls, were never out of doors all the time she had known them after six at night. 'We've always good health. We can all read.' [Here the three somewhat insisted upon proving to me their proficiency in reading, and having produced a Roman Catholic book, the 'Garden of Heaven,' they read very well.] 'I put myself,' continued the girl, 'and I put my brother and sister to a Roman Catholic school—and to Ragged schools—but I could read before mother died. My brother can write, and I pray to God that he'll do well with it. I buy my flowers at Covent Garden; sometimes, but very seldom, at Farringdon.....The two of us doesn't make less than sixpence a day, unless it's very ill luck. But religion teaches us that God will support us, and if we make less we say nothing. We do better on oranges in March or April, I think it is, than on flowers. We never pawned anything; we have nothing they would take in at the pawnshop. We live on bread and tea, and sometimes a fresh

herring of a night. Sometimes we don't eat a bit all day when we're out; sometimes we take a bit of bread with us, or buy a bit. My sister can't eat tatars; they sicken her. I don't know what emigrating means.' [I informed her and she continued]. 'No, sir, I wouldn't like to emigrate and leave brother and sister. If they went with me I don't think I should like it, not among strangers. I think our living costs us 2s. a week for the two of us; the rest goes in rent. That's all we make.'

"The brother earned from 1s. 6d. to 2s. a week, with an occasional meal, as a costermonger's boy. None of them ever missed mass on a Sunday."—p. 135.

Before taking leave of the religious condition of the London industrious poor, we will say a few words of the state of religion among the poor of the northern capital, Edinburgh. Last year, a series of letters appeared in the Scotsman, and was reprinted in a pamphlet, "on the destitution and vice of Edinburgh." The writer, Mr. James Bruce, is a Protestant; yet he gives the same sort of contrast between the Scotch Presbyterian and Irish Catholic poor. We will throw together a few extracts, as we have not space for much commentary.

"But the great peculiarity of the city of Edinburgh is, that within bow-shot of the splendid mansions of a population boasting themselves to be, in point of mere worldly refinement, at the highest pitch which either ancient or modern times have witnessed, and possessed of a purity in religious knowledge and practice unexampled amongst Christian nations,—within bowshot of this population a kingdom of darkness, misery, and vice, has erected itself, and is daily strengthening its fortifications and deepening its trenches. In close juxtaposition with a population who vaunt that their city contains every element necessary to train them up as one family to God, there is growing up another population, strong in numbers and desperate in misery, who are to all intents and purposes *practical heathens*. In close geographical contact with each other, there are existing two populations,—the one of which is as far separated from the other in habits, feelings, and outward appearance, as if a hemisphere had intervened between them."—p. 3.

"As to the almost total neglect of the wretched and the criminal by the clergy, both Established and Dissenters, it is perfectly amazing, and is a subject to which I shall be obliged to return again."—p. 13.

"Especially and emphatically, I impute much blame to the general culpability of the clergy, who, holding an express commission to seek out the lost and the wretched, discharge almost

none of those duties which are more expressly laid on their shoulders than on those of other men. In a great many of these wretched places—in the haunts of female depravity, I found that the unhappy inmates knew not even the names of their parish ministers, nor of their dissenting brethren and rivals. I hope I am not to be impudently told that this is the blame of these wretched creatures. It is their blame indeed, but their sins are not those which the world neglects to condemn. But it is ten thousand times more the blame of the ministers of the gospel. The minister of the Established Church, in particular, I must hold to be the minister of all who live within the territory of his parish, without respect to creed, profession, or character. It is his business, if any of his parishioners, from wretchedness or profligacy, will not go to him, to go to them, and introduce himself to them, not waiting till the request for an introduction come from the other side. It is his business—for which he receives wages—to open the door where misery and crime have taken up their abode, and ‘where lonely want has retired to die,’ and say, ‘I am Mr. —, your parish minister; I am come to see you as is my duty, and to do you good if I can.’ I cannot look on a minister of an Established Church, who does not do this, in any other light than as a cheat who accepts payment for work which he does not work. But I must not discharge from sharing in his guilt the Voluntary ministers, who, with loud professions of zeal for the good of their fellow-creatures, have neglected a wide and glorious field for missionary labour in the dens of the High Street, the Canongate, and the Cowgate. I must not be told that ministers would be ill used or rudely received in these places. It is not true. I have sought out every place where I had information that vice and wretchedness were to be seen in their worst and most hideous aspects. I have mingled freely with drunkards, thieves, and unfortunate women, and I declare solemnly and gratefully that I have met with nothing but genuine natural politeness. Even the Scottish profligacy was civil; and while an unpolite Irishman is a rarity, an Irish woman not polite is, I suspect, something that has not yet been discovered in this world.”—p. 21.

Several similar charges of neglect occur; and we will now give extracts that refer to the state of Catholics, and the conduct of their clergy.

“In the West Port there is a great variety in the character and appearances of the dwellings of the poor and of the poor themselves,—all of them not being anything like equally wretched or filthy. In Inglis’s Court is a room with four families in it at once—all Irish and all Roman Catholics. There is the landlord, or master, Robert Kelley, who says he supports himself by keeping these lodgings—he has two children with him, and five in America, who have plenty of money.—‘I go to the Roman Catholic Church, with

the blessing of God, almost every morning—and particularly, with God's grace, on Sunday mornings,—it would be a hard thing that would keep me from the church, I feel such a happiness in the Roman Catholic religion.' ”—p. 11.

“The High Street and its closes are inhabited, in a great measure, by a Scotch population, and it is here that female profligacy is most abundant. When the late Daniel O'Connell once asserted the superiority of his countrywomen over those of England, in respect to the comparatively smaller amount of unchastity amongst them, he was assailed by an injudicious portion of the press as a slanderer of the purest of the sex. He was perfectly right, however, in point of fact—as far as England is concerned—and if he included Scotland under the head of England, he was still more strongly in the right. Whenever, amongst the females in all parts of Edinburgh, you meet with those in whose whole appearance their wretched occupation is inscribed in unmistakeable characters—you find them to be Scottish—a great many, indeed, of the native growth of the modern Athens, reared within the sound of many Sabbath bells, and under the eye of an infinite variety of benevolent and philanthropic institutions—reared in the very neighbourhood of ladies who are not content to be devout in private, but who crowd with their presence every assemblage where discourses are delivered on the best means of protecting from crime and degradation the more wretched of their countrymen and countrywomen. On the other hand, in the lowest hovels occupied by the Irish—where you find that thieves reside and resort—where riotous persons are every other night apprehended by the police—you do not find these appearances—but on the contrary, everything to induce you to believe that in this respect the females are distinguished from our countrywomen, living in what appear to be similar circumstances.”—p. 19.

“This is the only case of conversion that I met with ; in most cases the Roman Catholics living in misery and dirt, and perhaps crime, felt a pride in avowing their attachment to a Church whose expansive arms embrace the most wretched of her children. The Roman Catholics in the low localities are twice as well attended by their priests as Protestants in similar circumstances are. I found that absence from the church on the part of the family was generally followed by a visit from the priest, and that the sick beds of his flock were not unattended. This is the way over all Christendom. The priests of Rome every where do their duty to their Church. The great and the wealthy have their polite confessors ; but the poor, and the miserable, and the vicious, are not thrown out of the pale. It is with sorrow that the friends of the Reformation must confess that the magnificent eulogium which the Viscount Chateaubriand, in his work on English literature—where he claims Shakespere as a papist—has pronounced on Romanism at the expense of Protestantism, is, in respect to the sympathy which the

ministers of that church have ever shown with the condition of the lowest of the poor, not wholly unfounded. One fact on this point is decisive—the dirty Romanist family generally wash their faces once a-week and go to the idolatrous mass. The dirty Protestants will not wash their faces, nor go to the next street to hear the glad tidings of the gospel. Our clergy should really lay these things to heart. It is hard that the art of winning the affections of the poor should be all with the priests of a superstitious worship.

“I found in the large hall a Catholic class of about ninety-seven children. Their teacher, Mr. Donlevy, was catechising them. They were answering questions—it is right to speak plainly out—with regard to the degree of respect due to the Virgin Mary. I have at present no business with theological controversies, but I may in one word be allowed to say that these children were made to speak of the Virgin Mary in language quite similar to that which has been used towards her by Jeremy Taylor and Lord Bacon. One of the school books here is, ‘A Short Historical Catechism, by M. L’Abbe Fleury.’ The children sang a hymn beautifully.”

—p. 30.

“In the West Port, I found that the name of the Rev. Mr. Tasker of the Free Church was honourably coupled with the names of the Roman Catholic priests as one who did not neglect the duty of visiting.”—p. 42.

We feel sure, that the many coincidences between Mr. Mayhew’s and Mr. Bruce’s narratives, will serve as corroborations of what both state about the religious state of the poor, and the care taken of them by their respective clergies. We might now close our article, did we not wish to send our readers to bed in a good humour, which we do not think we can better do than by giving them an extract or two from the experience of a “street-patterer,” and “chanter,” on the subject of “papal aggression.” The patterer is one who shouts out “cocks,” murders, or any other wonderful news, along the streets, as the contents of a paper which he sells. The chanter is one who sings songs in a similar manner. We give first the patterer’s experience :

“From the same man I had the following account of his vocation up to the present time :

“Well, sir,” he said, ‘I think, take them altogether, things hasn’t been so good this last year as the year before. But the Pope, God bless him! he’s been the best friend I’ve had since Rush, but Rush licked His Holiness. You see, the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman is a one-sided affair; of course the Catholics won’t buy anything against the Pope, but *all* religions could go for Rush. Our mob

once thought of starting a cardinal's dress, and I thought of wearing a red hat myself. I did wear a shovel hat when the Bishop of London was our racket; but I thought the hat began to feel too hot, so I shovelled it off. There was plenty of paper that would have suited to work with a cardinal's hat. There was one,—'Cardinal Wiseman's Lament,'—and it was giving his own words like, and a red hat would have capped it. It used to make the people roar when it came to snivelling, and grumbling at little Jack Russell—by Wiseman, in course; and when it comes to this part—which alludes to that 'ere thundering letter to the Bishop of Durham—the people was stunned:

'He called me a buffalo, bull, and a monkey,
And then with a soldier called Old Arthur conkey
Declar-d they would buy me a ninepenny donkey,
And send me to Rome to the Pope.'

"'They shod me sir. *Who's* they? Why, the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman. I call my clothes after them I earn money by to buy them with. My shoes I call Pope Pius; my trowsers and braces, Calcraft; my waistcoat and shirt, Jael Denny; and my coat, Love Letters. A man must show a sense of gratitude in the best way he can. But I didn't start the cardinal's hat; I thought it might prove disagreeable to Sir Robert Peel's dress lodgers.' [What my informant said further of the Pope, I give under the head of the Chaunter.]—p. 224.

"Hollest weren't no good either, 'cause the wictim was a parson. If it had happened a little later, *we'd* have had it to rights; the newspapers didn't make much of it. We'd have shown it was the 'Commencement of a Most Horrid and Barbarous Plot got up by the Pope and Cardinal Wiseman *for-r* the Mas-ser cree-ing of all good Protestant Ministers.' That would have been the dodge, Sir! A beautiful idear, now, isn't it? But the murder came off badly, and you can't expect fellows like them murderers to have any regard for the interest of art and literature. Then there's so long to wait between the murder and the trial, that unless the fiend in human form keeps writing beautiful love-letters, the excitement can't be kept up. We can write the love-letters for the fiend in human? That's quite true, and we once had a great pull that way over the newspapers. But Lord love you, there's plenty of 'em gets more and more into our line. They treads in our footsteps, Sir; they follows our bright example. O! isn't there a nice rubbing and polishing up? This here copy won't do. This must be left out, and that put in; 'cause it suits the walk of the paper. Why, you must know, Sir. I know. Don't tell me. You can't have been on the *Morning Chronicle* for nothing.'"—p. 225.

"I don't know of anything fresh that's in hand, Sir. One of our authors is coming out with something spicy against Lord John, for doing nothing about Wiseman; 'cause he says, as no one thing

that he's written for Lord John ever sold well, something against him may."—p. 226.

We think the idea quite excellent; that many of the newspapers of late, and in the matter of Papal aggression particularly, have taken after the patterer literature, and have modelled their articles upon the "horrid conspiracy" principle, and even stepped over the boundary line, into the "massacre" department. Where there has been such a "glorious rivalry," it would be invidious to make a selection by way of illustration.

The chaunter's experience on the same subject is as follows.

"'The Pope sir,' he began, 'was as one-sided to chaunt as to patter, in course. We had the Greeks (the lately arrived Irish) down upon us more than once. In Liverpool street, on the night of the meeting at Guildhall about the Papal Aggression, we had a regular skrimmage. One gentleman said: 'Really, you shouldn't sing such improper songs, my men.' Then up comes another, and he was a little crusted with port wine, and he says: 'What, against that cove the Pope! Here, give me half a dozen of the papers.' The city was tidy for the patter, Sir, or the chaunt; there was sixpences; but there was shillings at the West End. And for the first time in their innocent lives, the parsons came out as stunning patrons of the patter. One of 'em as we was at work in the street give a bit of a signal, and was attended to without any parade to the next street, and was good for half-a-crown! Other two stopped that very same day, and sent a boy to us with a Joey. Then me and my mate went to the Rev. W.'s, him as came it so strong for the fire-works on the Fifth of November. And we pattered and we pattered, and we chaunted and we chaunted, but no go for a goodish bit. His servant said he weren't at home. In course *that* wouldn't do for us, so down he came his-self at last, and says, very soft: 'Come to-morrow morning, my men, and there'll be two gentlemen to hear you.' We stuck to him for something in hand, but he said the business had cost him so much already, he really couldn't. Well, we bounced a bob out of him, and didn't go near him again. After all we did for his party, a shilling was black ingratitude. Of course we has no feeling either for or agin the Pope. *We* goes to it as at an election; and let me tell you, Sir, we got very poorly paid, it couldn't be called paid, for working for Lord John at the City election; and I was the original of the live rats, which took well. But there's a good time coming to pay Lord Johnny off.

"Some of the tunes—there's no act of parliament about tunes, you know, Sir—was stunners on the fiddle; as if a thousand bricks was falling out of a cart at once. I think, 'The Pope and Cardinal Wiseman,' one of the first of the songs, did as well as any."—p. 226.

We take our leave of Mr. Mayhew's instructive volume, and we shall follow his steps with interest, into the haunts of every class of poor. We shall be satisfied if we shall have awakened Catholic sympathies, in favour of a great work which seems committed to our Church, that of evangelizing the poor in London. We well know what a lively zeal in those who have neglected them, the very starting of any plan of ours would excite; many, we believe, would rather let them perish as infidels or brutes, than see them reformed by us. But let us not fear to keep this duty before our minds, for the time may soon come, when it may become more nearly pressing.

SUMMARY NOTICE OF FOREIGN CATHOLIC LITERATURE.

German Catholic Publications.—Serial Works.

THE publications of Catholic Germany have accumulated so rapidly since the last detailed notice of German Literature contained in this Journal, that we have found the attempt to embrace all, or even the principal portion of them, in a brief summary like the present, a perfectly hopeless task. We have thought, therefore, that it would be at once more interesting and more useful, to confine ourselves, in the first instance, to a few of the more important (especially of the serial) Catholic publications; reserving for a future occasion a detailed review, or at least a complete enumeration, of all the works of prominent merit which have appeared during the last eventful years in Catholic Germany.

The extent and variety of the Catholic literary establishments of Germany, and the number of Catholic laymen, as well as clergymen, who make literature the chief (or at least subsidiary to the chief) pursuit of their lives, afford an opportunity in that country for combined action upon a larger scale, and thus for the execution of more comprehensive literary projects, than we can venture to contemplate in these kingdoms, or even than it is possible to

expect from our more favoured brethren in France or Italy. It is to the great works, therefore, like the *Kirchen-Lexicon*, or the *Katholisches Conversations-Lexicon*, which have been undertaken upon this plan, that we would point, as illustrating far more than the productions of individual authors, the intellectual activity of Germany; and perhaps we shall best exhibit these peculiar characteristics by extracts from some of the remarkable articles which they contain, than by any general description of their contents.

- (1.) *Conversations Lexicon für das Katholische Deutschland*. [A popular Encyclopædia for Catholic Germany. Edited by DR. WILLIAM BINDER, in union with a number of Catholic scholars.] 12 vols. 8vo., Ratisbon, 1846-50.

We must begin with the *Katholisches Conversations-Lexicon*, or German Catholic Cyclopædia. It is an attempt to supply to Catholics a safe and useful substitute for the popular Cyclopædia known in Germany under the same name, and rendered tolerably familiar in this country by the English translation published several years since. With a vast amount of useful and interesting information, however, the *Conversations-Lexicon* combines so much of bigotry, and so many dangerous, and indeed absolutely noxious principles, as to be entirely unsuited for a conscientious Catholic reader. Dr. Binder therefore formed, about ten years ago, an association of Catholic literati, for the purpose of compiling a Cyclopædia on strictly Catholic principles, the work whose title is recited above. It displays, perhaps, some marks of haste and want of concert in its compilation. But many of the articles are of the highest order of merit, especially those upon historical, philological, and ethnological subjects.

We must content ourselves with a single specimen from an article upon the Life of Christ; and this we select especially because, as the author is a layman, the reader may look with more of interest to his performance upon a subject which, among ourselves, would be supposed to be reserved exclusively for a clerical pen. With all the learning which it exhibits, the reader will not fail to be struck by the strong German character which pervades its entire tones.

The writer is Dr. Sepp, a very learned and talented disciple of the illustrious Görres, who has written a much admired work, entitled, "the Life of Christ,* in seven volumes," 1842-7. It is partly didactic, partly descriptive, and is throughout a confutation of the infamous book of Strauss.

* *Leben Jesu Christi*.

The article in question is a sort of summary of Dr. Sepp's large work, which though possessing many great merits, yet as the production of a young author, labours under some defects, especially that of want of condensation. The author has turned to great use the Rabbinical writers, and his researches have thereby contributed to throw much light on many passages of the Gospels. He has broken the critical weapon of Strauss in his own hands, and that writer's attempt to prove the mythic character, and later rise of the gospels, has served only to bring out in clearer light their historic reality, and their contemporaneous origin with the events they record.

The following passage on the universal expectation of the Messiah will be read with great interest.

"When by Adam's fall, man had lost the one original consciousness of God, and had fallen under the servitude of sin; when his intellectual faculties were narrowed, and himself given up a prey to every error; when he had become weak and wavering in his will, crippled as all its energies were; and when his body itself had become frail and mortal; then had the All-merciful consoled our first parents, banished from paradise, with the promise, that a deliverer should be born of the woman to crush the head of the serpent, or the principle of evil;—a *second Adam* to raise sunken man from his fall, to point out to him the true path, that is to say, the true religion, and lead him back to God, illuminate *his mind* with ideas of truth and virtue, strengthen *his will* for good by Divine Grace, and by his own resurrection and the victory over death, insure even man's *corporeal* immortality. All nations, separated as they were by diversity of language and of myths—a diversity, the result of the decay of the one primitive religion—had carried into their respective homes the *divine promise of the Crusher of the serpent*, the Goël, or the Θεος σωτήρ, or by whatever other name they greeted the future Redeemer, and had there planted anew their paradise. The saga of redemption forms the real kernel of all mythology; and in every historical precursor who appeared to the heathen world as a typical God and Saviour, was prophetically shadowed out the type of Him, who in the fulness of time came forth as the true Son of God and the Redeemer, and by whose revelation were first opened to the mind of men the sense of nature or of creation, the understanding and the object of history, and the consummation of all religion. When now the middle period of time had arrived, then God sent his only-begotten Son. He was born of a Virgin, as this, too, was in the expectancy of all nations. But the middle or fulness of time is the holy jubilee period of redemption, after whose evolution the nations expected from the East the great Divine King, and regenerator of the world. Hence at the commencement of our era—at the acknowledged close of the four ages of the world, or of the golden,

silver, brazen, and iron periods, and the four universal monarchies corresponding to it, all the inhabitants of the earth were filled with the hope of the Messiah, and the eyes of all were directed towards the East. Among others, Tacitus (Hist. v. 13.) and Suetonius (Vespas. c. 5.) relate that men were convinced from an old and constant tradition, that it was determined by destiny, and was recorded in the old sacerdotal books, that about this time the East would attain to power, and a ruler would go forth from Judæa, who would possess the empire of the world. All nations had their holy cycles, or sacerdotal eras, according to which the future age of the promised deliverer was calculated.

"Thus a generation before the birth of Christ, the Etrurian Seer and Interpreter of the sacred books, Nigidius Figulus, according to the statement of Suetonius, announced to the assembled Senate of Rome, that the eight prescribed days of the world, as related in the Sybilline books, had run out their course; or that in other words, the *eight phœnix cycles*, or eight periods each of 540 lunar years,* thus in toto, 4320 lunar years of expectancy had come to an end. He in consequence hailed the new-born son of Octavius, the subsequent emperor Augustus, as the promised Saviour of the world. Nay, at the same time (according to the statement of Julius Marathus, recorded by Suetonius), a foreboding report being in circulation, 'that nature bore a king to the Roman people,' the Conscript Fathers were so terrified, that in the interest of the republic they decreed a sort of Bethlehemite infanticide. In the same way the Jews had a prophecy from the school of Elias, that the Messiah would come thirty generations after Abraham, or as it is still more clearly expressed in the Talmud, 'This world will not endure less than eighty-five Jubilees, and in the last, that is, the eighty-sixth, the Son of David will appear.†....."

"The ancients all knew this proper human year of 273 days—the time, to wit, that man lies in his mother's womb, or as many days as elapsed from the ebb of the Nile till the returning inundation. This we see particularly among the Chaldeans, who count 2222 years to the flood, which, as years of nine months, accurately coincide with the 1665 years of the Hebrew text. Thus between the computation of the Septuagint and of the Hebrew Bible, there is no real difference. Even the Jews, in civil life, reckon 4320 lunar years, or 4191 solar years, till the time of the Messiah's birth. This is evident when we annex to the sum of the world's years down to Christ, which they reckon according to their present computation, the 432 years (the tenth part of the holy period), that the Sanhedrin at Tiberias, under the presidency of the younger Hillel,

* Solinus. (c. 36.)

† Traktat Sanhedrin, fol. 97, col. 2.

in the year 358 after Christ, deducted from the old computation, and thus indefinitely prolonged the hope of Messiah's advent. The same law of the eight Phoenix periods of 540 years (the still prevailing Easter cycle), as well as the ten Indian yoghis of 432 years, or as the Persians call it, the Salchodai or Great Divine year of 1440 years (the great intercalary period of 365 days), forms in its triple course the end and the concluding number to all the chronological systems of the ancient world, and the pivot of its expectancy for the hour of salvation. This is the middle point, or the fulness and consummation of time, which the hand of the world's clock pointed to, and whereby the moment of Redemption, or of the second spiritual creation, coinciding with that of the first creation, appears marked out through the whole planetary system. A great jubilee—an apokatastasis—had occurred in the whole solar system, and throughout all the spheres of heaven there was intoned amid the eternal harmonies, a far sublimer *Gloria in Excelsis Deo*, than was heard by the shepherds of Bethlehem, for the Saviour of the world, and the Redeemer of all creation was born."—vol. ii. p. 1011-12,

We wish that our space permitted us to pursue the train of reasoning by which Dr. Sepp shows, that the Gospels, so far from being fabulous in their contents, as the impious Strauss had pretended, abound in allusions to the contemporaneous events of our Saviour's time, and that even the parables and similitudes of our divine Lord were sometimes drawn from historical incidents. Thus, the attempt to volatilize the Gospel history into a myth, has served only to establish more clearly its substantial reality.

We shall on some future occasion recur to this valuable and interesting work of Dr. Sepp, which has excited the greatest sensation among the Catholics and Protestants of Germany.

- (2.) *Kirchen-recht* (Canon Law). By DR. GEORGE PHILLIPS, Professor of History and Canon Law at the University of Innspruck. Vols. i.—iii. Ratisbon, 1848-50.

Professor Phillips's great work on Canon Law, although it is not, like the publication just described, the production of many hands, is at least so far a serial, that its volumes have appeared at regular intervals. It has now reached the third volume, which, to the general reader, is more interesting than either of its predecessors. The former volumes are occupied with the details of Church law, while the third is devoted to the general questions connected therewith.

In the first portion of this volume, the history of the relations between the Christian Church and the State, is traced out in their successive development—in the time of Rome's pagan emperors—of the Christian empires in the east and west—in the Mediæval period—and in modern times. Next are examined the relations

of the Church to the schismatical and heretical State, as well as its actual external condition, especially in Germany. In the appendix are inserted the concordats and other ecclesiastical documents of great importance.

In the second part of this volume the sources of Canon Law are investigated. These are, in the first place Scripture and Tradition—next, Papal constitutions, decrees of general councils, decisions of provincial councils and concordats. The volume closes with considerations on oral or unwritten law, or custom, considered as a source of ecclesiastical law.

An analysis of this important work is here of course out of the question. The reader will perceive that the first part of this volume is more of an historical than legal purport. And rarely in any regular historical work have matters of more intense interest been treated with so much ability and learning. The book is distinguished for the orthodoxy of its principles, for lucidness of method, extent of historical research, sagacity of observation, and a clear and lively style. The Gallican and Febronian doctrines have found in Dr. Phillips a most formidable foe.

Our readers will rejoice to hear that this able and learned Catholic writer, who, by the wretched ministry of Bavaria, that some years ago ministered to the vengeance of Lola Montes, was so shamefully deprived of his professorship at Munich, has been appointed by the Austrian Government to the chair of History and Canon Law at the University of Innspruck, and is now, it is said, about to be invited to the Imperial University of Vienna. This nomination, which is a homage to Catholic principles, as well as to distinguished talent, reflects the highest credit on the present Austrian Ministers.

We must cite a passage or two from this remarkable volume; but we must remind the reader that the strength of such a work as this lies not in its detached parts.

“In the discord between Church and State, Godfrey, of Vendôme recognizes the overthrow of all divine order; yet the reconciliation, as it really took place, was possible, because christian society was completely imbued with the desire of belonging entirely to the Church, as the kingdom of God. She was completely conscious, (as we have proved in section 102 116,) of what divine right required for the relation of the two powers ruling the world; and if in those ages it did not attain to the entire fulness of this idea, yet the fact, as far as was possible among men, closely approximated to this idea. But the decisive principle was this: Church and State must be united; this concord, however, is only possible by the general refection of every opinion, which the Church designates as erroneous, only possible under the supposition of the unimpeded action of the Church in the administration of the sacraments entrusted to her, only possible as soon as her freedom in her government and administration is acknowledged. But collateral with

these rights, is the obligation entailed on the Church of respecting the free exercise of the secular power in its appropriate sphere, in so far as it violates not the divine law, compact and lawful customs. As these principles were then realised, so political society dwelt with the Church in one and the same house.....

"The Church was accordingly recognized as the all-embracing kingdom of God, wherein the highest secular potentates, as sheep belonging to Peter's fold, must come in at the door of the sheep-fold, which is Christ. Hence, in this kingdom, all are mere subjects.

"If, accordingly, all Christendom forms in history but one great kingdom, so, on the other hand, the assumption is not consistent with historical truth, that the popes, especially Gregory VIII., had conceived the plan of founding a vast Theocracy, in the sense that all the kingdoms of the earth should be in a feudal relationship with the pontiff.* On the whole, in the later judgments which we form on history, we are too apt to consider it as the work of human design, and to regard many an historical phenomena, which has grown up according to the providence of God, as the result of the long devised and deeply meditated scheme of man. The popes had not any kingdom to found; the kingdom in which they were the sacerdotal kings, had been established by God Himself, and with all the greatness of character many among them exhibit, they were still mere instruments in the hands of the Almighty for the furtherance of His designs. But they were useful and apt instruments for their divine Lord and Master; and, inasmuch, as they consented to be so, they have their share in the glory and splendour of the Church. When, therefore, the popes cast out of the communion of the Church, even kings and emperors, who had revolted against the laws of God, and disturbed it by secession and schism; when they bereaved them even of their throne, and severed the bond which united them and their subjects; when, further, the holiest and most learned writers of that age regarded this power of the popes as perfectly natural and legitimate;—so these are, on one hand, thoughts which, in earlier times, had not been enunciated with such clearness, and, on the other hand, facts which had formerly not been brought out into equal prominence. But the former are no new discoveries of the human mind, and the latter no pretensions of human pride and ambition. Not then for the first time had the popes become the successors of St. Peter; not then, for the first time, had they received the power of binding and of loosing, nor the supreme ministry and sacerdotal royalty. But then

* The whole of this subject in regard to the particular kingdoms, respecting which this assertion has been put forth, Bianchi has illustrated with much learning. See his work, *Della Potestà e della Politia della Chiesa*.—tom. i. p. 328, and seq.

only could Peter in his successors exact from all society because it had become christian, and been subjected to him in Christ, the unqualified obedience, to which, in recompense of his love, the Saviour had brought the world under him. The principle was not new, that two powers are to govern the world—the maxim was not new, that the secular power should be subordinated to the spiritual; but it was only the comparisons, under whose veil the dogmas were set forth by the loftiest minds of those ages, which (and that only in a partial degree) might be called novel. But these comparisons were beautiful and pertinent: the divinity of the two powers—their strength and their sharpness were after the example of St. Bernard, fitly symbolized by the two swords which God had left on the earth.”—*Kirchen-recht*, Vol. iii. p. 180-2.

There are yet three more volumes of Dr. Phillips's Canon Law to appear; and every friend of religion, as well as of science, will hope to see a speedy termination to the work. When this labour is ended, Dr. Phillips will then resume the task of completing his great History of Germany, two volumes whereof appeared twelve years ago. When brought to a close, it will hold the very first rank in German literature.

(3.) *Kirchen Lexicon. F.* (Ecclesiastical Encyclopædia.) Published with the approbation of the Archbishop of Freyburg. Freyburg. 1848-50.

The *Kirchen Lexicon* is an Encyclopædia of Theology and the kindred sciences, edited by the most eminent divines, Biblical Critics, Canonists, Archæologists, and Historians of Catholic Germany, and numbers a staff of not fewer than one hundred writers. It is in alphabetical order, and the last number which has just issued from the press, reaches to the letter M. When completed, it will form about eight or ten large octavo volumes, at the very moderate price of sixteen or twenty dollars, or about two pounds ten shillings.

When we inform those of our readers, who may happen to be acquainted with German literature, that Theologians and Biblical Critics, like Döllinger, Haneberg, Staudenmaier, Kuhn, Hefele, Welte, Movers; Canonists like Phillips and Moy; and Historians and publicists like Hurter, Höfler, Guido Görres, Bass, and others, are among the contributors to this work, they may judge of its value. Many of its articles possess transcendent excellence; the work is conducted on the most orthodox principles, and is written throughout with great ability, learning, and elegance of style. It is adapted alike for the general scholar, and the man of the world, as well as for the Theologian; and some of the historical and political articles are of the greatest interest.

We shall best enable our readers to judge for themselves as to the great merits of this Encyclopædia, by citing, almost at random, a few passages on those matters in which they are most interested.

The Spanish Inquisition is a subject which much occupies, at the present moment, the attention of English Catholics. Dr. Hefele, a distinguished pupil of the illustrious Möhler, has a long and interesting article on this subject, which may be regarded as a very useful appendix to the no less solid, than brilliant letters of Count Maistre, whereof an English translation has recently appeared. The following passage contains a summary refutation of the mis-statements and calumnies often put forth against this tribunal.

"On the political character of the Spanish Inquisition, three Protestant authorities of our times have expressed themselves to the following effect. 'If I do not err,' says Ranke, 'it follows that the Spanish Inquisition was a royal judicature furnished with spiritual weapons. In the first place, the Inquisitors were functionaries of the king. He had the right to appoint, and to dismiss them; like other offices, the courts of the Inquisition were subject to royal visitations; and often members of the Supreme Council of Castile were the assessors in such visitations.' It was in vain Cardinal Ximenes objected to the appointment of a layman on the part of king Ferdinand the Catholic to the Council of Inquisitors. 'Do you not know,' replied Ferdinand, 'that if this Council possesses any judicial powers, it is from the king it derives them?' When Llorente speaks of a process which was attempted even against Charles V. and Philip II. it is clear, even from his own narrative, that Paul IV., then involved in open war with the Emperor and the King, proposed something of the kind, but not that it had ever been instituted, or even that an attempt of that sort had been made.

"Secondly, all confiscations decreed by this tribunal escheated to the Crown.....Thirdly, by this institute, the power of the Sovereign was completely consolidated; for he had in his hands an authority from which no Grandee, no Archbishop could escape. As accordingly this tribunal depended on the authority of the Sovereign, so the exercise of its jurisdiction, conduced to the extension of the royal prerogative. The Inquisition was one of those spoils of priestly power, such as the administration of the grand commanderies, and the appointment to bishoprics, that had served to aggrandize the Spanish Government; it was, above all things, in its spirit and object, a political institute. —*Fürsten und Völker* part i. p. 242).

"To the same effect does Professor Leo express himself. 'By the Inquisition,' says he, 'which was an Ecclesiastical Institute entirely dependent on the Crown, and was levelled at clergy and laity alike, Isabella contrived to bend the Nobles and Churchmen of Castile to her will.' (*Universal History*, vol. ii. p. 431.) Lastly, Guizot says, 'The Inquisition was at first more political than religious, and destined rather for the maintenance of order, than the

defence of faith.' L' Inquisition fut d'abord plus politique que religieuse, et destinée à maintenir l'ordre plutet, qu' à défendre la foi.—(*Cours d' Histoire Moderne.*)

"First, if we wish to form a correct estimate of the Spanish Inquisition, we must judge it not according to the maxims of the nineteenth century, but according to those of the age in which it sprang up. In the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, the principle *cujus est regio, illius et religio*, (and this was the basis of Spain's State-Inquisition,) was everywhere in full force, and in Protestant States, was, to say the least, as severely applied, as in Spain.

"Secondly, the penal code of those times was much bloodier, than that of the present age. We are now amazed at the severity of the so-called Carolina—a criminal judicature established by Charles V., in the year 1532; and yet this was a mitigation of the law prevalent in the fifteenth century. But even the Carolina (in the 106 section) annexes to religious offences blasphemy against God, for example, and the Blessed Virgin, the penalty of death; and in the 116 section, Sodomites are threatened with the punishment of fire. The same severity do we find in the chastisement of purely civil offences; the coiner, for instance, is by the 3 section, to be burned; and every repetition of theft to be punished with death.—(See the 159 and 162 sections.) In like manner, in France, formerly the slightest offence against the safety of public high-ways, was visited with capital punishment.

"Thirdly, in judging of the Inquisition, we are not to overlook the fact that capital punishment, on account of heresy, was, in former times, common to all countries, and to all religious communions. Of this Michael Servetus is an example, who, at Calvin's instigation, suffered at Geneva, on the 27th of October, 1553, on the charge of heresy, a painful and lingering death by fire. Even the 'mild' Melancthon, in a letter addressed to Calvin, approved and lauded this proceeding. And besides Servetus, many others, like Valentine Gentilis, Bolsec, Carlstadt, Grütet, Castalio, and the Councillor Ameaux, were taught by imprisonment, exile, and death, that among Protestants no milder Inquisition prevailed than in Spain. Nay, so late as the year 1724, a young soldier at Reaubsburg, in Holstein, for the offence of having made a league with the devil, was, by a royal indulgence, punished merely with decapitation. And at Bern, in the year 1753, a fanatic, Jerome Kohler, was, under the charge of 'blasphemy,' strangled and burned.

"Fourthly, the so-called witches and magicians constitute a very considerable portion of the victims of the Inquisition; and it is needless to say that these unfortunate creatures sustained no less bloody persecution in Germany than in Spain, and on the part of Protestants not less so than that of Catholics. Nay, in the year 1781, the Spanish Inquisition pronounced its last sentence of death; and one year later, (1782,) a Calvinistic tribunal, in the Canton of Glarus, burned a witch.

"Fifthly, the Spanish Inquisition has been often held up as the product of *Rome's* religious despotism ; but people have overlooked the fact that it was precisely the Popes who were the least favourable to this institution, and on most occasions sought to set limits to its jurisdiction. Of the efforts of Pope Sixtus IV. in this regard we have already spoken. It was Rome that, against the will of Ferdinand the Catholic, and Charles V., obtained that those prosecuted by the Inquisition might appeal to the Pope. Repeatedly, too, have the Popes exhorted the Inquisitors to mildness, striven to save the property of those sentenced only to lighter punishments, as well as for the children of the condemned ; took many cases out of the hands of the Inquisitors, and evoked them to Rome ; quashed many sentences of the Holy Office, and laid many of its officials under excommunication, as for instance Leo X, in 1519, excommunicated the Inquisitors of Toledo. Besides Leo X., Gregory XIII. sought to mitigate the rigours of this tribunal ; and Paul III. bitterly complained of the Spanish State-Inquisition, and protected those who sought to prevent its introduction into Naples.

"Sixthly, that in the Holy Office the *torture* was applied, is true ; but all secular tribunals of the time made use of it ; and when in these it fell into disuse, it was abandoned by the Inquisition also. On the whole, the Inquisition, in despite of all its severity, was, in the treatment of prisoners and of the condemned, milder than other judicatures of the time, whether in Catholic or Protestant states ; its prisons were roomier and healthier, and in very rare cases only were manacles and fetters applied : and even the use of torture was more restricted than elsewhere, and in each trial was not to be resorted to more than *once*.

"Seventhly, it is common enough to regard the Inquisition as a great institute for imprisoning men, whose polypus arms would, on the very slightest suspicion, grasp its unfortunate victim. But this was not the case. 1. Every tribunal of the Inquisition opened its proceedings with the promulgation of a period of grace, and issued a public proclamation, that whoever was conscious of apostacy from the faith, but within the prescribed term, would voluntarily surrender himself, and do penance, should be graciously absolved, and released from all severer penalties. These terms of grace were frequently renewed and prolonged. 2. The issue of orders for imprisonment was subjected to many restrictions and reservations. 3. No one could be imprisoned if his offence were not placed beyond a doubt by adequate proofs. 4. It was only when the members of the subordinate tribunals of Inquisition were unanimous, that they could order an imprisonment ; otherwise such an order could be pronounced only by the supreme Council of the Holy Office. 5. Whether an expression denounced contained anything heretical, was a question that could be decided only by the so-called *Qualifiers* ; that is to say, theologians that took no part in the Inquisition.

"Eighthly, the trial must take place in the presence of two Priests

that were not unconnected with the Inquisition, and who, in their character of Scabini, had to prevent ill-treatment and tyranny towards prisoners. The statutes expressly require that the accused should be treated with great kindness, and be constantly allowed to sit. It was only while the acts of accusation were read the prisoner was to stand up. The statutes moreover command that the accuser should be as much distrusted as the accused, and that the judges must carefully eschew beforehand all partisanship. Every accused man must be allowed an advocate. The accuser must take an oath that he was animated by no private hatred; and false accusers were very severely punished. The protocols must be twice read to the prisoner, and twice acknowledged by him, before they were considered valid. Moreover, the Inquisitors were commanded to be careful and vigilant in the reception of everything that could conduce to the defence of the prisoner. That the accusers and witnesses were not named to the accused is true; but for this there was a good reason, which Ranke has rightly appreciated, when he says, (loc. cit., p. 247,) 'this concealment of witnesses and accusers was introduced, in order to protect them from the persecutions of rich and powerful culprits.' And even later, when it became usual to name the witnesses, their names were withheld in those cases where the accused was a Count, a Duke, a Bishop, or a Prelate. Further, the prisoner could, beforehand, declare that this or that person was his personal enemy, and then this individual could not be employed as a witness. Lastly, the accused, in disproof of his guilt, could call a number of witnesses, and these, if necessary, must be fetched from America.

"Ninthly, every sentence pronounced by a provincial tribunal of Inquisition was subject to the revision and sanction of the Supreme Court, the Grand-Inquisitor, and his Council; and it was only by the confirmation imparted by the latter, the decision obtained legal force. But even the Grand-Inquisitor, before he gave his confirmation to the sentence, must solicit the suffrage of a number of Jurists, *Consultors*, or Advocates, who were not officials of the Inquisition. Further, the accused could *abhor*, as was the saying, or protest against all the judges of a provincial tribunal; and the Supreme Council was then obliged to appoint others. If there was no confession of guilt on the part of the prisoner, conviction was a work of uncommon difficulty.

"Tenthly, fearful is the notion which we form of an *Auto da Fé* (actus fidei—act of faith), as if it were nought else but a prodigious fire and a colossal pit, around which every quarter of a year Spaniards sit like cannibals, to take delight in the burning and roasting of some hundred culprits. But I may be allowed to assert, that in the first place, the *Auto da Fé* did not consist in burning and killing, but partly in the *acquittal* of those falsely accused, partly in the reconciliation of the contrite and penitent with the Church; and there were many *Autos da Fé*, wherein nothing was burned but

a wax-light, borne by the penitent as a token of the rekindled light of faith. Llorente, for example, relates in proof of the great zeal of the Inquisition of an Auto-da-fé at Toledo, on the 12th of February, 1486, in which not fewer than 750 culprits were punished. Now, among all these, not a single individual was executed, and their punishment was nothing more than a public ecclesiastical penance. A second grand Auto-da-fé took place again on the 2nd April of the same year, 'with nine hundred victims,' and of these nine hundred, *not a single one* was punished with death. Of all the trials of the Inquisition, which Llorente has recorded, but very few terminated with the death of the guilty : and no one will suppose that Llorente sought out the very mildest cases, and strove to conceal the severer ones. On the contrary, it is his well known purpose to depict the Inquisition in as frightful colours as possible. From all that has been said, however, it is clear wherefore the Spanish people, as Llorente himself confesses, saw in the Autos-da-fé rather acts of *grace* than of *cruelty*, and wherefore persons of all sexes and conditions, men and women of the highest birth took part in such occurrences.

"After the reconciliation of the penitent had been accomplished, the obstinate heretics, and those whose offences were partly of a civil nature, were delivered over to the secular arm.

"Eleventhly, even those most severely punished, and doomed to execution, were far from being all heretics. On the contrary, the Inquisition punished sodomites and polygamists ; and of the latter description of persons, there were from the example of the Moors not a few in Spain. Even the ordinary *fornicator* fell under the competence of the Inquisition, when he had seduced a virgin by the assertion, that the matter was not sinful ; and in like manner the clergyman and the monk who married, whether he concealed his state of life, and so deceived a woman, or deluded her by the pretence, that even as a clergyman, he might marry. The same is to be said of all confessors, who seduced their female penitents : *ecclesiastics*, who dissuaded the women with whom they sinned from going to confession ; *laymen*, who exercised ecclesiastical functions ; *deacons*, who heard confessions ; and every one who falsely gave himself out as a Commissioner of the Inquisition. Further, *sacrilege*, *blasphemy*, *usury*, even *murder* and *rebellion*, when they had reference to this tribunal, fell under its jurisdiction. The offences of its servants also, were within its competence, and especially those guilty of an illicit connexion with the female prisoners, were punished with death. Even smugglers, who in time of war delivered their horses and ammunition to the enemy, and lastly, a number of witches, magicians, preparers of love-potions, false and hypocritical saints, and in general, all who wished to turn to their own profit the superstition of the people, were subject to the adjudication of the Holy Office. Whoever will call to mind the number of witches alone that were burned in Germany, will not be surprized that in

the three hundred and thirty years of its existence, the Spanish Inquisition should, according to the statement of Llorente, have condemned thirty thousand heretics, witches, magicians, polygamists, smugglers and others, to death. Yet, Llorente is very inaccurate in his statement of numbers; and many of his reckonings are decidedly wrong; as for instance, when he asserts, as we have above seen, that in the year 1481, about two thousand persons had been executed. (*Hefele's Cardinal Ximenes*, p. 346.).....

"Lastly, we often hear it said, that the Inquisition crushed the intellect of the Spanish nation, and its love and cultivation of science; and this is regarded but a natural and necessary result. But as to the testimony of history in this matter, the writers who make this accusation, seem to trouble themselves little. It was precisely in the period when the Inquisition first rose, the sciences began again to flourish in Spain. A great number of schools and universities were erected: the art of printing was introduced, and the classical studies especially, were prosecuted with great ardour. The Belles Lettres and every species of poetry were cultivated—celebrated scholars were invited from foreign parts; the nobility again acquired a taste for learning, and far greater literary activity and energy prevailed in Spain at that time, than at the present day. I am far from wishing to ascribe to the Inquisition these fair productions of literature, but I think I may venture to assert, that this Institution had not the effect of a savage tempest, sweeping away all the blossoms of science. It was precisely the most brilliant epoch of Spanish literature, stretching from the close of the fifteenth to the end of the seventeenth century, that included the period of the Inquisition's greatest power. All the most celebrated writers of Spain then lived, and their works were printed with the license of the Inquisition. Cervantes, Lopez de Vega, and Calderon, as well as the great Spanish historians, Pulgar, Zurita, and Mariana, belonged to this period. In his second book, Llorente cites one hundred and eighteen men of learning, who were cited before the Inquisition; but even he is obliged to confess, that not a hair of their head was touched. In confirmation of this, we may assert that the greatest scholars of Spain have even judged favourably of the Inquisition; above all, Zurita, renowned for his liberal views, the philologist Peter Martyr, and the learned Jerome Blancas.

"After all these observations I must aver, that I am far from wishing to apologise for the Inquisition in itself. On the contrary, I deny the right of the secular power to fetter the conscience, and am heartily averse to all religious coercion on the part of the State, whether it proceed from a Torquemada in a Dominican habit, or from a Bureaucrat in a state uniform. But I wished to show that the Inquisition was not the horrible institution, that ignorance and party-spirit would fain represent."—p. 653—6. No. 55. *Kirchen-Lexicon*.

There is also a most admirable article in the same Encyclopædia by Dr. Döllinger, which, though only forty pages in length, contains more interesting and important matter in it, than long biographers published respecting the celebrated Reformer. Dr. Jarcke inserted several years ago in the *Historisch-politische Blätter* a most able article on the psychology of Luther, wherein he showed how his doctrine of justification had grown out of the peculiar mood and constitution of his mind. Luther early evinced the wayward fancies and sickly exaggerations of the heretical spirit. Of the infinite love and mercy of the Almighty, he could with difficulty form an idea, but the awful notion of his justice was ever present to his mind. Thus, because a youthful companion had been struck down by lightning at his side, he took a vow to dedicate himself to the monastic state—a vow which against the advice of his father, as well as his own feelings, he persisted in fulfilling. The attractive image of his crucified Redeemer, he would instinctively turn from in fear; and when at Rome he wished his mother dead, that he might be the means of praying her out of purgatory.

The circumstances which facilitated the religious enterprise of Luther, are powerfully depicted in the following passage.

“The progress of the new tenets was not arrested by the circumstance, that their author was for a short time withdrawn from the eyes of men; for the fire of his doctrine had been cast into the dry bushes, whereof there was no lack in Germany; and so, sometimes in one place, sometimes in another, the flames burst forth. It was a spectacle which kept all minds in suspense—a contrast which gained for him and for his cause the sympathies of all better men. On one side, there was a whole host of prelates, ecclesiastical dignitaries and beneficiaries, over-abounding in worldly wealth, and who led a life of ease, little caring about the wants and the decline of religion, and looking on in indolent repose on the stormy assaults which were being made on the Church. On the other side stood a simple Augustinian monk, neither possessing nor seeking after those things which the others had in such abundance, but who fought with weapons that the others could not command,—with intellect, with captivating eloquence, with theological learning, with firm courage and unshaken confidence, with a glow of enthusiasm, with the energy of a will called to rule over others, and with the most tenacious perseverant industry. Germany was then a virgin soil, whereon no journalism, no literature of pamphlets had been planted. Little or nothing of importance had yet been written on public matters affecting the whole community, and questions of higher interest on other topics did not then occupy the public mind. Hence the feelings of men in all classes of society were more susceptible of this religious excitement; and the people, as yet unaccustomed to pompous declamations and rhetorical exaggerations, were the more ready to believe on his word a man, who as a priest and divinity professor at an university, preferred, at his

personal risk, and with, in general, such little contradiction, the most formidable charges against the Church. And these accusations, these references to a doctrine hitherto wickedly suppressed and cancelled, which were pronounced in language of such exquisite force, were accompanied with such constant appeals to Christ and the gospel, and interwoven with apocalyptic images applied to the Papacy and the whole state of the Church, and calculated powerfully to work on the imagination. The writings which now for the first time discussed the whole ecclesiastical system and its abuses, were on one hand, interwoven with scriptural words, sayings, and ideas, and on the other hand, were composed by an artful demagogue, well conscious of his purpose, and knowing perfectly the weaknesses of the national character; and thus were alike calculated to be read out in public houses and in the streets as from the pulpit.

"More powerful still than these external causes of success were the internal ones inherent in the very system of the Reformer. These were sweet, flattering, consoling doctrines, which for two years, and still more in the subsequent period, had been proclaimed to the people from so many pulpits, in so many songs, and in countless writings;—the doctrines, to wit, of justification without any self-preparation, and by the mere imputation of the sufferings and merits of Christ, of the immediate assurance of the state of grace and felicity to be obtained by a single act of faith; the dogma, further, that good works are excluded from all influence on the present righteousness and future happiness of man, and that every christian is in possession of a mere putative righteousness, obtained without trouble by a single act of faith. And to this we must add the new christian liberty, which, as the self-constituted advocate of pretended rights trampled under foot in the Church, Luther so energetically proclaimed,—the liberty, namely, to rise superior to the laws and ordinances of the Church; not to fast, not to confess, and so forth, or to do this and the like only at the suggestions of one's own fancy. 'Oh! what glorious preaching was that!' exclaimed Wicelius later, 'no more fasting, no more praying, no more confessing, no more sacrifice and alms-deeds.' * * * *

"But the new gospel not only promised a far easier and more certain acquisition of spiritual and future goods, but it opened, especially to princes, nobles, and municipal magistrates, alluring prospects for the obtaining of earthly possessions. Very many among them were deeply involved, and saw in ecclesiastical property a fund from which they could pay their debts; and the confiscation of episcopal possessions furnished the princes, more especially, with the wished-for means for rounding off their states, and for consolidating and extending their territorial power.

"Lastly, in the deadly struggle which he waged against the Church, Luther had two powerful classes of men for his confederates. The one consisted of the Humanists, Philologists, and more learned school-

masters, who had issued from the school of Erasmus, and in the following year from that of Melancthon; men who felt a hearty dislike for the clergy, who were hitherto so powerful, and in possession of all the more lucrative places, and to whom they mostly felt their superiority in learning. These men now eagerly assisted in stirring up the distrust and aversion of the people against the priestly order. All these must have regarded Luther as one of their own body, and as a promoter of the pursuits as well as interests of their class, especially as he deduced the downfall of pure doctrine from the neglect of the original languages of scripture, the Greek and Hebrew tongues, and promised to rebuild his Church on the basis of philosophy. The other class was far more numerous, and included the rising generation, the academic youth, and the young men who had just entered on the business of life. All these admired and revered in Luther the hero of the day—the most imposing character that Germany could then exhibit,—the man who wielded the sword of eloquence, and with] whom none of his German adversaries could cope,—who, in fine, represented a new and vigorous cause—that of progress and enlightenment, while the Catholic Church and her defenders appeared as the representatives of all that was obsolete and reactionary, though such things were then designated by other names.”—(*Kirchen-Lexicon*, p. 659-60. No. 69.)

The article winds up with a most masterly characteristic of the German Heresiarch.

“Often it was the melancholy result of his doctrine which passed like warning phantoms before his conscience—the rupture of the Church, one and united before him—the harvest of discord, that had sprung up in his own religious community—the immorality everywhere apparent—the false security nurtured by his new dogma of Justification—the disappearance of all more earnest religiousness;—and moreover, the depressing consciousness more than once expressed by him, that since his separation from the Church, he had himself morally degenerated, and become more tepid. So he acknowledged, for instance: ‘I must confess, for my part, and doubtless others must confess the same, that I fail in the zeal and earnestness which now more than ever I ought to have, and am much more negligent than formerly under the Popedom; and there is nowhere such earnestness in the Gospel as formerly we saw among Monks and Churchmen.’ All these self-reproaches and thoughts, with the ulterior consequences they involved, he sought to hush and banish from his mind by the notion that they were suggestions of the devil, who sought thereby to lead him astray, and drive him to despair. Hence in his writings, and especially in his letters and confidential communications, the frequent occurrence of such expressions as that ‘he was in the hands of the devil,’ that Satan had transformed himself into Christ, ‘and that he, Luther, with all his knowledge of Scripture, could not stand up against him, and that he must pass whole nights in wrestling with

Satan, who often in disputation pressed him so hard, that sweat-drops of anguish ran down him.' In all this Luther sought to gratify his self-love, and console himself with the fancy that the devil had invented for him especially great and extraordinary temptations, whereof his adversaries, the Papists, knew nothing; and from which even the Fathers of the Church had been exempt. Compared with these assaults, the ordinary temptations to carnal sins and the like were mere trifles. * * * *

"From all his hyperbolical expressions, and paradoxical descriptions, thus much is clear, that it was the reproaches of his own conscience, and doubts in the soundness of his religious system, especially his doctrine of justification, that he would fain to himself as well as others, represent as peculiar artifices of Satan. They were temptations such as every sincere and earnest christian has to encounter; but with this great difference, that he is not responsible for all that lay to the charge of Luther; and that a Christian resting on the foundation of the Church, can far more easily overcome such doubts and temptations to unbelief, because his faith is upheld by the testimony and authority of the whole Church. * * * *

"As a polemic, and an author of theological, and especially popular controversial writings, Luther united to an undeniably great dialectic and rhetorical talent, an unscrupulousness such as has rarely been paralleled in this department of literature. It is one of his most usual artifices to disfigure a doctrine or an institution by the most absurd caricature, and then forgetting that what he combated was in this shape a mere phantom of his own tortured imagination, to indulge in a strain of prolix censure. Too often he sinks to the tone of a spiritual charlatan, and indulges in hyperbolical phrases and hollow exaggerations. When he seizes a theological question, he perplexes it, often intentionally and studiously, and mutilates and distorts the reasons of his opponents, till they can be no longer recognized. But in despite of these defects, which render the perusal of his writings so wearying and repulsive an occupation, we still feel that he possessed, in a marvellous degree, the gift of popular eloquence; and that his democratic appeals were based on a most careful and accurate knowledge of all the weaknesses of the national character of the Germans.

"The manner, too, in which he treated the persons of his opponents, is really without example. Never is it pitying love, which hating the error, strives to win back the deluded; but it is rancour, hate, defiance, and contemptuous scorn, whence issue, as from an unfailing source, a torrent of invectives, and often of the coarsest personalities."

After stating that it is utterly untrue that this tone of abuse was prevalent in those times, the author continues:

"Further, in no other writer, as in Luther, do we find such enthusiasm for the inexhaustible wealth and divine character of Holy Writ, coupled with such violent perversion of the sacred text.

His attempt to expunge St. James's Epistle from the Scriptural Canon, the contemptuous language he applied to that portion of Holy Writ, are well known.....He had indeed only the choice either of entirely rejecting that epistle, or of resorting to those violent modes of interpretation practised by later protestant theologians, if he wished to set aside the marked discrepancy between the doctrine of that sacred document and his own theory of justification. Why he resorted not to the latter expedient, but to the former, is not clear. Conscientiousness in the explication of Holy Writ, and awe for the simple clearness of the sacred text, were certainly not the motives that determined his course in this instance, for the most arbitrary and palpably false interpretations were quite ordinary occurrences in his polemical writings. It is scarcely possible to carry this system further than he has done in his writings, for instance, against Erasmus, and in the passages cited even by Planck. If his false explanations most frequently occur by his fastening on Holy Writ his own peculiar notions, which, according to his own avowal, he had arrived at, not by a calm unprejudiced study of the Bible, but in a painful state of mental distraction and anguish of conscience, he will sometimes go a step farther in the way of arbitrary interpretation, and dress up the text, which he wishes to handle for polemical purposes, partly by means of mistranslation, partly by interpolation. When all this will not suffice, he will then oppose Scripture and Christ against each other, as for instance in the following passage: 'Thou, Papist, defendest thyself much with scripture, which yet is a bond-slave to Christ; I will not let myself be baffled thereby. I take my stand upon Christ, who is the right Lord and emperor over scripture. I care not about all the texts of scripture, even were you to cite more against me: for I have on my side the Master and Lord of scripture, with whom I hold, well knowing He will not lie, nor deceive me; and I will rather give unto Him the honour, and believe, than by all these texts let myself be moved one hair's breadth.' It would happen at times that a passage of the Bible, too plainly opposed to one of his favourite doctrines, cost him anxious hours; but at last he would tranquillize his exegetical conscience with the notion that this disquiet was only a temptation of the devil, who wished to lead him astray by texts of scripture, and drive him to despair. Thus did he do with the passage in 1, Tim. c. 5, 12.

"With these few traits in the sketch of the Reformer, we must rest satisfied. We must not, however, omit to mention, that from the year 1520, he put forth and circulated among the people, assertions respecting the sexual relations, marriage, and celibacy, which according to the testimonies of contemporaries, exerted in the remotest circles a very pernicious influence. Since the foundation of the Christian Church, he has been the first to assert the doctrine that man is the slave of an irresistible natural impulse, and

that the precept to marry is not only one obligatory on every individual, but it is of even a more stringent character than those commandments of the Decalogue, which forbid adultery and murder. In a sermon delivered in the year 1522, upon marriage, he put forth statements, and permitted rights, from which the natural conscience of a heathen would have revolted. Even the license to bigamy, which he granted to the Landgrave Philip, was only the result of an opinion, perfectly accordant with his whole religious system indeed—that even for Christians there was no precept of monogamy.”—p. 675-7.

A voluminous work like this, cannot be dismissed with one or two extracts. We shall cite the two following passages from Dr. Dollinger's sketch of Bossuet.

“Towards the Jansenists,” says he, “Bossuet observed great forbearance. Their principal theologian, Arnauld, was his personal friend, and composed some of his writings, especially his apology for the Catholics, and a work against Mallebranche, at his desire. Bossuet saw in this man, who was doubtless one of the most brilliant stars among the theologians of the seventeenth century, the victorious defender of the Catholic Church and Catholic doctrine against Calvinism; and being himself a rigid Augustinian, he judged the relation of Arnauld and his friends to the Papal See with the more indulgence, as it was only after Bossuet's death the Jansenistical party openly took up a schismatical position. Yet at an earlier period of his life, in the funeral oration, for instance, on Father Burgoing and Dr. Cornet, Bossuet had expressed himself against Jansenism in sharp terms. Afterwards on the well-known distinction *juris et facti*, he appears to have entertained an opinion partially favourable to the view held by the Jansenists. In his letter addressen to the Nuns of Port Royal, at the instance of Pérefixe, archbishop of Paris, he asserted that, ‘a pious submission’ to the judgment of the Church relatively to dogmatic facts, (in allusion to the heretical or orthodox character of the ‘*Augustinus*’ of Jansenius,) would suffice. His biographer, Cardinal Bausset, has not rightly understood this letter. But towards the end of his life, he modified this opinion, and declared in his last work on the ‘authority of ecclesiastical decisions,’ that every believer is bound to give to the judgment of the Church, even upon dogmatic facts, a perfect and unqualified internal approval (*persuasion entiere et absolue dans l'interieur*), and thus rejected in the most distinct manner the so-called ‘respectful silence,’ *silence r. spectueuse*, in favour whereof forty Doctors of Theology had then pronounced an opinion. In general, Bossuet most decidedly disapproved of the subterfuges resorted to by Arnauld, the four Jansenistical bishops, and the nuns of Port Royal, in order to justify their subscription to the Papal formulary, and their simultaneous adhesion to the doctrine of Jansenius. That the well-known five propositions really contained the sense of Jansenius's

work, and were, so to speak, the soul of that body, 'no one,' said Bossuet, 'who attentively perused the work, could for a moment doubt. Moreover, much in his posthumous writings appears to have been suppressed by his Jansenistical editors. We know, at least, that they suppressed a panegyric of his on St. Ignatius Loyola, and a writing upon the formulary of Pope Alexander VII., subscription to which had been ordained by Rome.

"Quesnel's work upon the New Testament, which was afterwards condemned by the Bull *Unigenitus*, Bossuet had ten years before approved, and had composed a preface, which was to be prefixed to a new, but *improved* edition of that work, warmly patronized as it was by Noailles, archbishop of Paris. But Bossuet perceived that the book needed great and essential *ameliorations*, called the archbishop's attention to a number of passages needing correction, and as the latter would not recommend an alteration in these passages, he withdrew his preface, which appeared long after his death under the title, prefixed by a Jansenistical hand, 'Justification des Reflexions Morales.' Later, Bossuet often declared, the book was so infected with Jansenism, as to be incapable of correction."—*Kirchen Lexicon*, vol. ii. p. 126.

Bossuet's perfect orthodoxy in this matter, and his hostility to Jansenism were well known; but we have never seen so full and satisfactory a vindication of the great theologian on this point, as is here given.

Again, on the subject of Gallicanism; it is easy for us who have witnessed the evil results that have flowed from it—and how it has been a weapon in the hands of Jansenism for evading the decisions of the Holy See, and an instrument in the hands of Catholic and Protestant governments for encroaching on the spiritual rights of the Church; it is easy for us, too, who have witnessed the successive repudiation, though not condemnation of the Gallican doctrines by Rome, to discern and lament the mistake of Bossuet. But we must place ourselves in the position of this great man, antecedent to our experience, and remember the opinions in which he had been educated (though then the Sorbonne was not near so unanimous on these doctrines, as Dr. Döllinger's language would seem to imply); and we shall then form a juster appreciation of his language and facts.

"The assembly of the French clergy of 1682, and Bossuet's position in it," says Dr. Döllinger, "has been very differently judged. The Gallicanism of that period, such as it was, enunciated by the assembly of 1682, consisted in a body of doctrines formed out of various views and interests. In the first place, a certain doctrinal tradition lay at the bottom of it—a tradition which, in France, rested on the decrees of the council of Constance, and still more on those of the assembly at Bourges, and the so-called Pragmatic Sanction, and which, as a system, had, since then, without intermission, been taught in the Sorbonne, to which Bossuet was in-

debted for his theological education. To this we must add the almost unconditional devotion of the higher clergy to the crown, fostered and confirmed as that feeling was by the almost idolatrous worship, which the whole nation paid to the king, and which, under Lewis XIV., had attained its acme. This enthusiastic feeling from which, according to St. Simon's remark, no one could entirely escape free, was the more likely to influence the clergy, as Rome by the Concordat of 1517, and by the immense Church-patronage which it thereby placed in the hands of the French kings, had linked the hopes, interests, and secular advancement of the priesthood, with the throne, and thus assisted in forming a powerful court clergy. Lastly, in the development of Gallicanism, the Parliaments, especially that of Paris, had their share. These corporations wished to domineer over the Church, to rule it according to their own traditionary principles, and make it an instrument for the promotion of their own corporate and family interests; but, under an energetic absolute monarch like Lewis XIV., they could not accomplish their purpose, which they succeeded in doing only under his feeble successor, Lewis XV. With this third species of Gallicanism Bossuet would have nothing to do; but he had already by education imbibed the Gallican principles of the Sorbonne, and his political views as to the absolute power and inviolable claims of royalty did the rest.

"At that period in the contest with the Holy See respecting the '*regalia*,' the majority of French bishops took the side of the king. Several of the prelates, and especially the bishop of Tournai, were disposed to push matters to extremes, and to reduce the papal rights (as was at a later period attempted by Febronius) within the narrowest limits. So it was, at all events, the high authority of Bossuet which prevented this symbol of Gallicanism—the four articles—from being framed in too offensive a form. In his sermon, too, on the 'unity of the Church,' which he delivered on the opening of the assembly, he set forth pure Catholic principles with that energy, and that splendour of theological eloquence peculiar to himself, and which, in Rome, met with the approval of the pope; while the later Jansenists, like Maultrot, asserts that this discourse is full of exaggerations, and is an arsenal for the Ultramontanes. Hence it was Bossuet who engaged the whole assembly to recognize an indefectibility in the Roman See, while the infallibility of the pope *ex cathedra* was rejected by it. The liberties of the Gallican Church, said Bossuet later, he wished to set forth in the *declaration* of 1682, as they were understood not by the Magistrates, but by the bishops: and as regards the authority of the Holy See, he desired so to explain it, that only what was calculated to inspire alarm should disappear, and this sacred power, without losing any of its prerogatives, might appear amiable even in the eyes of heretics and its other enemies. The large Latin work which he composed for the defence of the four articles, some (Sourdi, for instance),

have, without adequate grounds, suspected to be spurious. It is unquestionably the work of Bossuet, though he was far from having the intention of committing it in this shape to the press; but, on the contrary, in the last years of his life, he wished, in consequence of the reconciliation that took place under Innocent XII., to submit it to a comprehensive revision. In the treatise which he prefixed to it, and which appeared only in the year 1745, he expressly declares, come what may of the declaration of the four articles, it was not these, but the ancient doctrine of the University of Paris, that it was the object of his work to defend. These extensive changes, however, which Bossuet proposed introducing into his work, were not accomplished, or were, perhaps, set aside by his editors after his death."—*Kirchen Lexicon*. Vol. ii. p. 127-8.

We cannot withhold the expression of our admiration of this inimitable *resumé*. While Dr. Döllinger, as an Ultramontane divine, upholds his principles in their fullest strictness, he yet, from his good sense and good feeling, as well as ample historical learning, is able to make full allowance for the position which the great Bishop of Meaux took in the theological dispute of 1682.

- (4.) *Versuch einer Geschichte der Biblischen Offenbarung*. [History of Scriptural Revelation. An Introductory Essay to the Old and New Testament.] By DR. DANIEL HANEBERG, Professor of Theology, and Oriental Languages at the University of Munich. 8vo. Ratisbon, 1850.

Although we had originally intended to confine ourselves to the German serial publications, we cannot close without introducing to the reader's notice, a work of a different class, which was published in the course of the past year—Dr. Haneberg's History of Scriptural Revelation. From the strong tinge of what we are apt to call *Germanism* which runs through it, it can scarcely ever be popular among English readers. But at home it has created so extraordinary a sensation, that we are induced to append a brief notice of it, as one of the most remarkable books that has appeared in Germany for a long time. It is distinguished, not only for its great erudition and critical acumen, but for elevation of thought, warmth of piety, and elegance of diction. Its object is not only to establish the external evidences of revelation, but to explain its import, trace its progress and development, and move its inward congruity and harmony. Want of space, however, forbids us to make more than two extracts.

The first of these regards a point which, from its novelty, cannot fail to prove interesting—the Mosaic Genealogy of nations. We should premise that the author makes use of the most recent historical researches on all matters bearing, more or less directly, on sacred history.

"Providence, moreover, ordained that in the Mosaic Record

(Gen. c. x) should be preserved a genealogical table of all the nations sprung from Noah. This genealogy is, as it were, an imperishable document of the common origin of all the nations of the earth. Though even as yet, we cannot entirely comprehend it, still what we can understand affords us a warrant, that this genealogical table was drawn up by an eye-witness of the first origin of nations, and thus is either the fruit of an immediate inspiration of God, or the work of a contemporary of the first builders of Babel. This genealogical table sets forth an affinity between nations, the knowledge whereof antiquity could not possibly have arrived at, either by research or reflection. Even the Greek and Romans, with all their experience and intellectual culture, could not have divined, that they were more nearly akin to the Aarii (the Persians) and the Germans, than to the Syrians. Madai, Javan, and Gower, are according to the genealogical table kinsmen. Thus that the Aarii, Ionians, and Germans, are of a common origin—this most brilliant result of modern researches in comparative philology and ethnography, is found already recorded in the Mosaic narrative. The confidence which is hereby awakened, bids us in respect to the less clear and intelligible names in this Genealogy, wait for new confirmations to the sacred record, so soon as the sciences of geography and ethnography, particularly in Asia and Africa, shall have made further acquisitions. At all events, this genealogical table is a witness for the original equality of all nations. It reminds them that all the races of the earth are children of one holy patriarch—the priest, the prophet, the prince, and lawgiver, Noah. This memorial is the more important, as it is introductory to a section in the history of Revelation, which seems to throw all the nations into the shade, and make out one family as an object of exclusive favour.”—History of Revelation, p. 37—8.

In allusion to the Mosaic genealogy of nations, the illustrious Görres told the writer of this Review some years ago, that in the philosophy of history he was engaged on, he would prove the marvellous historical accuracy of that primitive title-deed of the human race. This task he has partly achieved in the interesting treatise entitled, “*The sons of Japhet and their Exodus from Armenia*,” 1845, which was one of his latest productions.

Our second extract is from Dr. Haueberg’s considerations, which are equally ingenious and pious, on the Symbolism of the Mosaic worship.

“The destination of one special place for sacrifice was too clearly ordained in the Mosaic Law, and the unity of the nation in the exercise of its religion was too clearly connected with the unity of its place of worship, to allow of the toleration of several places at the same time.

“Yet to be a bond of religious union was not the only destination of the tabernacle, and of the temple, which sprang out of it. The

regulations as to space, and the vessels to be employed, are so accurate, so minute, so immediately derived from God, that we are compelled to look for a *meaning* in them. By its *significancy* this holy structure exercised as well a spiritual and comprehensive influence, as by its exclusive singleness it seemed to limit all religious actions to one spot, and so to fetter them to the earth. If we would gather as follows the simple sense from the figure of the tabernacle, it would go in its typical character far beyond the bounds of the Old Testament, and speak in mute signs the whole destination of man, together with the means vouchsafed by God for the attainment thereof.

"In the inmost sanctuary failed the light of the sun, as well as all artificial light. Here was only the spiritual light of thought in the tables of the law as well as the supernatural splendour of the Shechina, over the ark of the covenant. Here was the miraculous manna-bread, and the equally miraculous flowering rod of Aaron. This part of the structure, accordingly, represented the higher world of spirits, whence all miraculous power descends, and to which man is called by grace and faith. The forms of cherubim over the holy ark with their four faces seemed to say: 'Man must bring together the kingdom of grosser matter, as well as vegetable and animal domains, and hallow, by exalting them to the supernatural world.'

"In the Sanctuary, where were the table of show-bread, the seven-branched candlestick, and the golden altar of incense, was typified all that man must go through before he can attain to his final term in the kingdom of illumination. He must detach himself from ordinary life, as this space of the tabernacle is detached; he must partake of the illumination and confirmation of grace, signified by the show-bread; and he must exercise himself in glad *worship*, for this is symbolized in the altar of incense.

"Yet though at particular hours man may rise in contemplation and prayer above the ordinary course of life, still, the reality of a fallen state, with all its thousand memorials of sin and imperfection still remains. Hence in the court there is a laver of purification, and an altar, partly for bloody expiation, partly for the consumption of those meats which man offers up in order to confess, to chasten, and to heal his distempered concupiscence.

"Thus the Sanctuary represents the three actual stages in the religious progress of man during his present life. The Court, with the altar of burnt offerings, symbolizes penance; the foremost sanctuary, with the golden altar of incense, the life of contemplation and exercise in prayer; and lastly, the Holy of Holies, the high state of union with God.

"But as even this state is subject to severe trials, so once in the year the Holy of Holies was sprinkled with blood. And as a life of contemplation is often visited with penitential sorrows, so the blood of many sin-offerings was shed on the altar of incense. On the

other hand, there were also, in the outer court, and even before it, offerings eaten,—the signs of a joyous intercourse with God by means of flesh and blood, as even in the penitential life divine consolations are not wanting.”—History of Revelation, p. 108-9.

With this interesting extract we must, for the present take our leave. It may be necessary, however to remind the reader, that the few works which we have been able to notice are brought forward, not merely for themselves, and for the valuable information which they contain, but rather as illustrating the activity, the fertility, and the enterprise by which the Catholic literature of Germany is distinguished. We preferred, in the first instance, to enable each one to judge for himself of the merit of these great and prominent publications. We might easily have added, had space permitted, still more striking evidence of this activity in the periodical publications with which all the great Catholic towns abound. Of these we have spoken in a former paper; and it is enough to add here, that they all continued to maintain the well merited reputation to which, on that occasion, we bore so willing a witness. The great Quarterly Journal of Tübingen, (*Theologisches Quartal-Schrift*,) and the bi-Monthly Journal of Munich, (*Historische-Politische-Blätter*,) never, since their first establishment, have exhibited greater power, or more solid erudition than in the present year.

As conveying a just idea, therefore, of the character and tone of Catholic Literature in Germany, it has seemed better to confine our notice to a few works of the class already described. Hereafter we shall take care to publish, for the information of our German scholars, a full and detailed catalogue of all the works of merit which have appeared of late years in Catholic Germany.

NOTICES OF BOOKS.

- I.—*Bertha; a Romance of the Dark Ages.* BY WILLIAM BERNARD MAC CABE. 3 vols. 8vo. London: Newby, 1851.

The “Historical Novel” has long been a most powerful instrument in the hands of those who seek to guide public opinion, or at least to influence or modify its tendencies. It is impossible to overrate the efficiency of such an instrument in an age of cheap literature and universal reading,

like the present. It is equally impossible to shut our eyes to a painful consciousness of the indifference with which the Catholic body has abandoned it, without a struggle, to hands which have only employed it for the purposes of open hostility or covert attack. All our own most distinguished historical novelists, with a few qualified exceptions, all the foreign authors whom it has been possible to press into service, will be found to have availed themselves of every privilege of their art, so as to represent the Catholic religion, its doctrines, its ministers, and its members, in the least favourable light of which they are susceptible. And as if in total unconsciousness of the advantage thus relinquished, no effort has been made upon our side to neutralize these evils, by supplying an antidote in our own literature.

The volumes now before us may be regarded as a first instalment of this important and indispensable work; and Mr. Mac Cabe has chosen his theme with a boldness which does credit not alone to his high Catholic spirit, but to his power of appreciating the true spirit of Catholic history. To vindicate the memory of the hated Hildebrand, and the usages of the despised Dark Ages; to place in its true light the whole history of a calumniated period; is an undertaking, the very boldness of which is a guarantee for the sincerity with which it is executed, and which should conciliate the sympathy of every honest and candid mind. The particular theme, too, which he has selected from this period—that which is commonly regarded with the greatest amount of prejudice—viz., the contest of Hildebrand with the Emperor Henry, lend an additional value to Mr. Mac Cabe's work, as illustrating the difficulties of mediæval history.

To the readers of this journal it is unnecessary to say, that Mr. Mac Cabe's previous studies, and his familiarity with the original chroniclers of the time, had evidently fitted him for the antiquarian portion of his task. Indeed, it is easy to see that this learning which pervades his work is not the result of special preparation, that it is not "got up" for the purpose, but is the natural and spontaneous outpouring of a well stored and highly cultivated mind.

The name of Mr. Mac Cabe's romance will in great measure explain its subject. It is founded upon the story of the attempted divorce of Bertha, the injured queen of Henry IV. of Germany. But the romance owes most of its interest to the fortunes of the subordinate actors in the

plot, and especially of a noble Saxon maiden, Beatrice, the object of the unlawful passion of the tyrant Henry, and of her lover, Count Magnus, the very ideal of a mediæval hero. We shall not anticipate the pleasure of a perusal by any analysis of the plot. Some of its details, are, perhaps, a little over-wrought and unnatural, but it is well contrived as a means of illustrating the peculiarities of the age. There is hardly a character in the social life of the mediæval period of which it does not contain some specimen; kings, statesmen, courtiers, bravoës, soldiers, churchmen, nobles and peasants, serfs and freemen. Nor can it be said that the author paints with a partial pencil. He has exposed with unsparing candour all the vices of the time, even those which a Catholic might feel the greatest temptation to palliate or to conceal. The avarice and ambition which had corrupted the State-Church of the German empire, are represented in their darkest colours in the pages of Bertha; but the contrast which they present to the generosity, the devotedness and zeal of the true servants of the Church, deprives the sketch of the objectionable character which, in the pages of anti-catholic novelists, it too frequently possesses.

We shall content ourselves with two extracts, as specimens of the manner in which Mr. Mac Cabe has executed his task. The first is his description of the Emperor himself, attended by two of those ill-starred councillors, by whose cruelty, ambition, and unscrupulousness, his fortunes throughout life were marred.

“There sat in an apartment, lofty, magnificently furnished, yet gloomy—for it was lighted but by two long, narrow slits in a thick wall—three men, as different in appearance, as they were in years from each other. The first was a meagre, frail looking old man, with white hair, thin nose, peaked chin, and in his small grey eyes that anxious, wavering look, which denoted that he was eager for the acquisition of wealth, and of a timid disposition. This old man wore the magnificent vestments of a Prince-Archbishop. He sat before a table, on which there were rich wines and a profusion of dried fruits, but his goblet filled to the brim, and the fruits that lay heaped before him, showed that he had not yet partaken of any portion of the feast to which he had been invited as a guest. At the table, and sitting opposite to him, was a man about five-and-forty years of age, low sized and thick set, with huge broad shoulders, and a hand so large, that the capacious goblet he held, seemed to be hidden within the cavity of the palm, rather than grasped by

him. The low forehead, and the short flat nose, as well as the gaping mouth, were scarcely discernible amid the mass of fiery red hair that covered his face, and gave him the semblance of a wild beast, rather than a human being. He sat and fed, or rather munched like a hog, and swallowed fast, one after the other, large goblets of the odorous old Rhenish wine. Between these two men sat—and with his back turned to the window, so that the beams of the red-setting sun seemed to bestow upon his features whenever he turned to his guests, a roseate hue—a young man, richly endowed with all the graces of youth. His hair, which was the colour of the finest flax, and of the polished smoothness of satin, fell in long ringlets upon his shoulders. His forehead was fair, broad, and majestic; his eyes of violet blue, seemed to beam with softness and the most tender affection; his nose straight, his chin round, his cheeks still bearing that peachy delicacy, which comes with boyhood, and always disappears in the first few years of manhood; his mouth, shaded by a slight moustache, and decorated with pearly teeth, might, from its rich and coral lips, be mistaken for that of a woman, but that sometimes, when it was intended to express a smile, it was seen, as if in despite of himself, to curl into a sneer, the malice of which was unmistakeable. To this face was to be added, all the advantages of a commanding person, so tall, and yet so graceful as to render that young man, even in the midst of the tall men of Germany, one remarkable for his height and dignity. This noble, this handsome, this truly royal looking young man, was Henry IV., King of Germany, the son of the Emperor, Henry III., and the Empress Agnes, the daughter of William, Duke of Aquitaine. The old man, who sat at his right-hand, was Sigefrid, Archbishop of Mayence, and the middle-aged man on his left, Count Diedrich of Treves."

As a pendant to this interesting description, we shall also transcribe the sketch of Henry's mother, the celebrated Empress Agnes, and of his beautiful but injured wife, the heroine of the tale, Bertha.

"I could not but recognise in the elder female some of the features of Henry, with the exception of the eyes and the mouth. There was the same high, commanding brow, the same straight nose, the same rounded chin, and the same awe-inspiring look. These were the resemblances between the two: but the dissimilarity between the woman and the man were still greater: instead of the flaxen locks of Henry, the hair of the female had become white as the drifted snow; instead of his laughing, red, rosy lips, the lips of the female were thin: and care had wrinkled the corners of the mouth, and affliction had set his seal upon it, as if a smile could now find no resting-place there; instead, too, of the peachy cheek of Henry, the cheeks of the female were of a deadly

paleness—so ghastly white, that the blood seemed never to have suffused them, and they were like the forehead, crossed and crossed again with deep lines, as if the vigils of the mourner had been broken in upon constantly by new affliction, and unlooked-for griefs. The face was that of a very old woman, which seemed to have been placed upon a person, that, in its erect position, and its rounded outlines did not seem to have reached, much less to have passed, the middle period of life.

“This was the Empress Agnes, the mother of King Henry.

“Her companion was young—very young—it would seem difficult to decide, upon first looking at her, whether she was sixteen or twenty years of age; for her figure was so slight, and at the same time so much beneath the middle-size of women, that one would long hesitate to say, that she could, by possibility, be older than sixteen, if there were not in the chastened eye, the grave look, and the pensive gesture in her movements, somewhat to demonstrate that more than the sorrows that vex the heart of a girl of sixteen, had found a resting-place in her bosom. She was of Italy, and there was no mistaking the place of her birth in her rich brown skin, her pearly teeth, her pouting mouth, her Roman nose, her jet black eyes, and her hair, that in the intensity of its blackness, gave forth a blueish hue. This beautiful and delicate young creature, on whose arm the Empress leant, now looked at Beatrice with an interest—an intensity of interest, which none but a wife can feel, when gazing on a female, who has unwillingly won, or unconsciously attracted the admiration of a husband. It was Queen Bertha, the wife of Henry, who knew that the lovely Beatrice was an unwilling captive in the power of her husband. Her features expressed what was passing in her heart—profound pity and irrepressible admiration—the first for the situation of Beatrice, the other for her beauty.”

With these extracts we take our leave of “Bertha.” They will be found a sufficient commendation. Nor do we think it necessary to say a word in order to urge upon our readers the duty, on grounds entirely independent of the merits of the work, of encouraging this first effort to redeem our literature from the disgrace which has so long hung over it. It is, after all, in this very department that the fiercest battle must be fought for our principles, our doctrines, and the fair memory of our greatest men.

II.—*The Irish Annual Miscellany.* By the REV. PATRICK MURRAY, D. D. Vol. II. Dublin: Bellew, 1851.

Those unhappy necessities of space which a quarterly reviewer so often has occasion to deplore, have compelled us to defer our notice of this admirable volume, until a time

when our judgments has, doubtless, been anticipated, by almost every reader. Far less varied in its contents than the volume of the last year, The "Irish Annual Miscellany" for 1851, is, nevertheless, in many respects, a more valuable contribution to our literature. Indeed, the exceeding importance of the subjects, and the elaborate minuteness with which they are treated in all their details, almost remove the two essays which compose the present "Miscellany" out of the rank of periodical literature altogether. The style of both is so condensed, the matter so copious and varied, the thoughts so pregnant and suggestive, that each might easily have been expanded into an independent treatise.

The volume is nearly equally divided between two essays, the first on "Miracles," the second on "Education, considered with Reference to the Interests of Religion and the Rights of the State and of the Church."

To attempt any examination, however slight, of either, would carry us far beyond the space even now at our command. In the first essay, the subject of Miracles is considered chiefly in its bearing upon revealed religion; but there is no topic, whether philosophical or theological, connected with these as the nature and definition of miracles, the certainty of their existence, the evidence by which they are established, their continuance in the Church, &c.—which is not fully considered; and so successfully has the author combined the strictest technical accuracy with that lucid and popular style which characterizes all his publications, that his work must prove equally attractive to professional and non-professional readers.

The essay on Education is written with singular calmness, moderation, and good taste; and it has the rare merit, especially in a matter which has been the subject of a discussion so protracted and so angry, of examining, fully and unreservedly, every important general principle involved in the controversy, and yet avoiding all just ground of offence to the honest advocates of either opinion.

To the readers of this journal it is unnecessary to add, that both essays display all that brilliancy and vigour of thought, that lucid order, that rare faculty of analysis and illustration, and above all, that manly and earnest tone, which they have so often had occasion to admire in the writings of the author.

III.—*The Lamp. A weekly Catholic Journal of Literature, Science, The Fine Arts, &c.*, Devoted to the religious, moral, physical, and domestic improvement of the industrious classes. Bradley, York, and Derby.

We have allowed this excellent periodical to remain unnoticed during the first months of its literary life, in order that we might be enabled to speak, with more confidence, of its merits, and of its prospects of success. We have watched it, nevertheless with no little anxiety; and the more so, because with its failure or its success, we felt assured that the hopes of a cheap Catholic literature for the working classes were in a great measure identified. It is with no ordinary pleasure, therefore, that we have seen it safely reach the termination of its first volume, and, what is more gratifying, that we have marked the progressive improvement which it has continued to exhibit. We can hardly doubt any longer the result of the experiment. "*The Lamp*" is destined, we trust, to form for many a year to come, the companion and the instructor of the humble catholic fireside.

Its plan is admirably suited to secure this result. The judicious admixture of entertainment and instruction which it contains, and the excellent taste with which even the driest, and in themselves most unattractive, subjects are treated, have in a great measure overcome what has been the greatest obstacle to the permanent popularity and usefulness of such Catholic periodicals; and we can hardly entertain a doubt that it is destined to prove, under Providence, a powerful instrument of the social and religious regeneration of our hitherto uninstructed and neglected poor.

IV.—*Romish Sacraments and the Confessional, as now taught and practised in the English Church; and, The Duty of the Church at the Present Crisis.* Two Sermons, by the REV. HENRY HUGHES, M. A. London; Rivington, 1850.

Mr. Hughes's Sermons, as will be gathered from their title, are directed against the Sacramental theories and practices introduced into the Anglican Church by the Tractarian movement, and carried to their full development under the auspices of Dr. Pusey. We have spoken elsewhere on this subject. The sermons are chiefly valuable for the facts which they embody; and, although the practical interest of the subject has, for the present, well-nigh ceased, Mr. Hughes's facts are well deserving of attention as materials for its history.

INDEX TO VOLUME THIRTY.

- Abelard*, Peter, 311—his death and character, 315.
Ages, middle or dark, what duration assigned to them, 279.
Albert Magnus, account of him, 324.
Appleyard, Mr., his work on the Greek Church, 34—his views on Church government, 26—on the conduct of the Popes, 30.
Apuley-house, site of, 37.
Aquinas, Thomas de, 325, 327—his works, 329.
Aristotle, when translated, 308—purified by St. Thomas, 328.
Arius, his opinions, 31.
Arnold, Dr., his opinion concerning images, 29.
Art, different schools of, 2—their purpose in the Church, 6.
Bacon, Roger, 323.
Benediction, the rite of, 21.—as practised in France and Belgium, 22.
Bennett, Rev. Mr., on the sign of the Cross, 149.
Bermondsey, 65.
Berthold, Archbishop of Mentz, 80.
Bibles, copies extant named by Mabillon, 297.
Bishops, their city residences, 46.
Boethius, 307.
Bonaldi, M. de, 379.
Bonaventure, St., 337—his works, 399.
Bonns Abbot, Robertson's calumny against him, 293.
Books, French notice of, 255.
Brucker, his testimony in favour of the monks, 285.
Buddhism, 434.
Bureaucrasy, 403.
Burke, Edmund, 374.
Calvinism, its political tendencies, 91.
Catholic Committee, desire the appointment of Bishops, 181.
Catholicism in Ceylon, its introduction there, 412—and progress under the Portuguese, 413—persecuted by the Dutch, 416—preferred by the people of Ceylon, 417—its progress under persecution, 418.
Cæsar, Julius, 410—his conquest of the Helvetians, 450—war in Gaul, *ibid*.
Charles Vth, Emperor, his faith in the Roman Church, 83.
 — Duke, son of Gustavus Wasa, 75—wrests the throne of Sweden from Sigismund, 76.
Charlemagne, the great, 300—academies he opened, 301.
Cheapside, 61.
Church, the Catholic, her characters of witness and teacher, 3—chooses different instruments, 4—cannot afford to lose time in her great work, 14—injurious effect of nationalism on the unity of, 27.
 — Great liberty she allows in politics, 374.
 — Her functions during the middle ages, 291.
Church, Greek, oppressed by the State, 25—parallel between its history and that of the Anglican Church, 28.
 — St. Paul's, 68.
 — Of England, lamentable condition after the Reformation, 219—strife of parties up to the present time, 223—without schools in which to train her clergy, 226.
Clarendon House, 39.
Clarke, Mr. Rochfort, his absurd dislike of pictures, 455.
Clemangis, his pamphlet, 282.
Clubs, 39.
Commerce, Street, value and classification of it, 491.
Commissioners, royal, for the reform of the Universities, under Henry VIII., 213—under Edward, *ibid*—under Mary, 215—and Elizabeth, *ibid*.
Costermongers, account by Mr. Mayhew, 487—their honesty, 502—morality, 504—literature, 508—politics, 510—law, 512—religion, 514.
Covent-Garden, 48.
Crime, chiefly punished in the lower orders, 486.
Cross, sign of the, 117—frequent use of it, 118—its universality, 120—analogy between the ancient and modern use of it, 127—effects ascribed to the use of it, 140.
Cunningham, Mr., his account of London, 37.
Curt von Burgsdorf, 94.
Dainties, prepared and sold in streets, 496.
Degrees, Academical, 318.
Delanere, a persecutor of supposed witches, 363.
Devotion, two schools of, represented by Mr. Pugin and the Oratorians and Jesuits, 10—to our B. Lady explained, 172.
Dialectics, of what use to religion, 304—use made of them against the faith, 310.
Druids the, their influence, 441.
Durham letter, 113.
Dutch the, their mode of converting, 418—failure of their attempt to christianize Ceylon, 424.
Education of Catholic Church students, 234.
Ely Place, 47.
England, greatness of, 249—a model of internal liberty, 405—spurious imitations of her constitution, 406.
Englishmen, character of 15.
Episcopate, ancient English, extinguished, 508.
Examination voluntary, in theology, 242.
Family the, first germ of all society, 293.
Fish, trade in, 492, 493—value and quantity used of, *ibid*.
Flowers, general love of, 498—value of, 499.
France, her ancient government, 407.
Friars, Franciscan, 63.
Game, consumption of, 496.
Gaufridy put to death for witchcraft, 362.
Gauls the, their habits, 411—fully equal to the Germans, 412—perpetually in motion, 444—their victories, 445.
Gerbert, Abbot, his works, 295.
German Books, notices of, 532.
Germany, state of, during the 16th century, 78.
Gents, Baron Von, 377.

Ofærer M., his history of Gustavus Adolphus, 71—his theories upon Church reform, 83—his inconsistencies concerning the Jesuits, 86—account of them, 87—his opinion of the Calvinists, 92—description of the Protestant courts, 93—his comparison of Catholics with Protestants, 96.
Government, civil, its origin, 300—of ancient France, 407.
Grandier Urbain, put to death for witchcraft, 364.
Green-stuff, valuable when sold in streets, 501.
Gustavus Adolphus, his education, 77—invades Germany, 98—his reasons for not marching to Vienna, 103—seizes Erfurt, 104—conditions he offers for peace, 106—character of the war in Bavaria, 107—his conduct at Munich, 108—endeavours to be acknowledged emperor, 111.
 ——— *Wasa*, his cruelty and ambition, 73—introduction of the reformed faith, 75.

Hallam, Mr., greatly over rated as an historian, 280—asserts that the monks preserved Literature, 283.
Haller, Albert von, 382.
Helvetii, the—their emigration, 446—difficulties of their march, 447—their defeat, 450.
Henoltson, the, 27.
Henry VIII. oppresses the Universities, 213.
Heresies derived from the writings of Plato and Aristotle, 303-316.
Heresy of the Manichæans, 316.
Hermannus, 308.
Hierarchy, Catholic, earlier history of, 177—greatly preferred then by the Government party, 186—desired by the Catholic laity in 1805-1803—whether necessary to ask Lord John's sanction, 191.
 ——— establishment of in North America, 191.
Hippisley, Sir John Cox, his account of the government of the Catholic Church in England, 183—mistake therein, 185.
History, in the league against truth, 112.
Horses, value of when dead, 497.
Huber, his account of the English Universities, 216-219, 221-222.

Iconoclasm, 453.
Images, veneration of 174.
 ——— apology for the use of, 457.
Insanity, forms that it takes, 333.
Irish, ancient. their superiority in learning, 286.
Irishmen, anecdote of two, 300.

Jameson's, Mrs., the principles of her two works on art, 401—her version of the legends of the saints not always correct, 463—arrangement of her first work on Legends and Legendary Art, 473—extract from, 474—her account of one subject, 476—gives too much prominence to the Artistic view of legends, 477—her "Legends of Monastic Orders," 478—legend of St. Francis, *ibid*—her account of Fra Angelico, 481.
Jurke, Dr. Charles Earnest, 383.
Jesua, combined all ecclesiastical characters, 5—labours of the society of, 8—secret of their influence, 9—inconsistent charges against them, 86.
John of Arc accused of witchcraft, 354.
John, son of Gustavus Wasa, 75—his red book, *ibid*.

Knut, Archbishop of Upsala, his martyrdom, 74.

Law, Canon, 206.
 ——— Civil, by which the ecclesiastical changes in England were brought about, 208.
 ——— Constitutional, the study of it necessary, 371.
Leubuscher, writer upon witchcraft, 334.
Lincoln's Inn Fields, 49.
Lombard, Peter, 318—his works, 320.
London, deficient in relics of the past, 35—monastic character of before the Reformation, 62, its remembrances, 37.
 ——— transformations it has undergone and is undergoing, 67.
Ludgate hill, 55—and its neighbourhood, 56.
Luther, his political doctrines, 81.

Mayhew, Mr., his researches amongst the poor, 487—his classification of them, 487—account of their honesty, 502—morality, 504—literature, 508—politics, 510—law, 512—religion, 514.
Maistre, Count de, 377.
Manuscripts, ancient, of the Middle Ages, 299.
Maximilian, the Duke, 106—his embarrassing position, 109.
Merivale, Mr., his Roman history, 437—deficient in original references, *ibid*—political mistakes, 438—his account of the Gaulish populations, 441—inaccuracies, 442—mistaken in his theory that nations are always in a state of progress, 451.
Minster, Anglican, as he leaves the University, 211—at his ordination, 242—his utter ignorance of theology and discipline, 243.
Minorities, the, 63.
Miraculous events as easily received in the primitive Church, as in the present day, 464—as proved in a part of their literature, 466.
Missionaries, Protestant, in Ceylon, their want of success, 424.
Missions, Catholic and Protestant in Ceylon, compared, 427.
Monks, services they rendered to France, 279—were not the causes of the decline of literature in the Middle Ages, 2-3—testimony rendered to them by Brucker, 285—their conduct to their servants, 292—labours in transcribing, 293—not merely religious works, 295—eminent scholars amongst them, 307.

Nationalism, its injurious effect upon the Church, 27.
Nobility, 401.

Olbert, Abbot, 294.
Oatory, congregations of the, 9—their devotional exercises, 16 estimation in which it is held at Rome, 20.
Othlonus, a monk, his labours, 294.
Oxford, University of, 215.

Park, the, 39, St. James', 41.
Pasion of our Lord, Catholic devotion to it, 171.
Paul's Cross, 56.
Philothous, by Theodoret, 467—miracles recorded in it, 468—and visions, 471.
Phillip Neri, St. 9.
Piccadilly, 38—streets adjoining it, 39.
Poor the, injustice to them, 487—Mr. Mayhew's researches among them, *ibid*.
Popes, the, their conduct, 30.

- Poverty*, the fate of it in England, 485—gradations it goes through in capitals, *ibid.*
- Power*, political, a subject of legitimate ownership, 398—example, 400.
- Proletarianism*, 485.
- Property*, anterior to civil law, 388.
- Pugin*, Mr. 1
—standard to which all Catholic practices must return, 13—how far possible, *ibid.*
- Pullus*, Cardinal, his works, 322.
- Pusey*, Dr. his system, 15.
—Dr. course proposed by him in the controversy about Baptism, 153—controversy with Mr. Dodsworth, 154—his reference to the Fathers, 156—his defence of himself concerning confession, 153—concerning the Blessed Eucharist, 162—and circulating Catholic books, 168, his objection to the veneration of images, 174.
- Queen*, the, whether or not in fact the fountain of all ecclesiastical honour, 202.
- Republic*, Roman, the history of it instructive, 436.
- Riculpus*, Bishop, his pastoral letter, 302.
- Russell*, Lord John, concerning the establishment of the hierarchy, 190—whether he could have consented to it, 200.
- Saints*, a new class arose about the time of the Reformation, 7—of the saints of the Society of Jesus, 8.
- St. Sulpice*, seminary of, course of education there, 234—of Theology, 245.
- Saracens*, comment upon Aristotle, 308.
- Schlegel*, F. 381.
- School*, derivation of the word, 299.
- Schwarzenberg*, Count of, his policy, 100.
- Scotus*, John Erigena, 289.
- Sigis* in London, 66.
- Simon Magus*, reality of the legend concerning him, 477.
- Soldan*, writer upon witchcraft, 334.
- Spee*, Frederick, evidences concerning witches, 347—account of his life, 366—his work against the persecution of witches, 367.
- Spring Gardens*, 43.
- State*, the, considered as a Corporation, 381—physiology of, 382—mistaken notion concerning the origin of a state, 391—of the monarchial, 393—military, 394—Theocratic, *ibid.*—the republic, 395—error in a bureaucratic state, 403.
- States-Constitution*, 401.
- States-general* in ancient France, 407.
- Strand*, 43—sites adjoining, 43.
- Sunnenæder*, Peter James, bishop of Westermæs, his martyrdom, 74.
- Symbols*, 475—of the Pelican, *ibid.*
- Temple gardens*, 53.
- Tennent*, Sir Emerson, his work on Ceylon, 410—attempts to account for the rapid progress of the Catholic faith, 415—compares the Catholic religion and Buddhism, 421—admits the good conduct of the Catholics, 422—astonished that the protestants do not succeed, 427—the fact explained, 429—*anecdote*, 430.
- Titles*, territorial of Bishops, 204.
- Theology*, impossible that it could exist after the Elizabethan University reform, 218-220—can never exist save under a suitable authority, 224—further reasons for the absence in University education of all Theology, 240—especially moral Theology, 243—course of it given at St. Sulpice, 246—method of teaching, 303.
- Tortures*, 346.
- Triumvirate*, Roman, 439.
- United Brethren*, their Church Government, 203.
- Universities*, Commission for examining them, 208—change produced on the character of their studies by the change of religion, 209—their previous history, *ibid.*—and studies, 211—subject to the Holy See, *ibid.*—their height of intellectual activity, 212—and decline, *ibid.*—oppressed by Henry VIII., 213—results of the Reformation upon the morals of, 215—state of study, 217—up to the present day, 222—at the present time, 225—effects of the education they give upon Church students, 226—compared with the training of Catholic Schools, 234—knowledge of Divinity required at the University for Church ministers, 238—examination of students, 241—merits of their teaching, 248—their doctrines, 251.
- University of Paris*, 210.
- Vegetables*, consumption of, 404.
- Vespers*, whether or not a popular service, 12, 23.
- Vicars Apostolic*, first appointment of them, 176—increase of their number, 179—their appointment not acceptable to the Clergy, 180.
- Waldenses*, whether witchcraft really did exist among them, 353.
- War*, of the Thirty Years', in Germany, 60—new works giving an account of it, 71—its results, 113.
- Weier*, his evidence concerning witchcraft, 355.
- Wesley*, his methods with the people, 19.
- Whitefriars*, 53.
- William*, Abbot of Kirscham, 197.
- Wiseman*, Cardinal, his communications with Lord Stanley, 197.
- Witchcraft*, its history yet to be written, 331—what degree of reality in it, 333—gave a character to insanity, 336—*anecdote*, 337—trials to which those accused of it were subjected, 341—tortures, 345—manner in which confessions were extorted, 349.
- Universal terror excited by the idea of it, 335—believed in by the chief Reformers, 358—the idea of it arising from excitement of mind, 359—diminished when disregarded, 360—*anecdote*, *ibid.*—a priest accused and tortured, 362—gradual decline in the mania, 369.
- Witches*, more mercifully dealt with by the Inquisition than the secular tribunals, 356.
- Xavier*, St. Francis, his conversion of the Singalese Buddhists, 412.
- Zeno*, the Emperor, 27.

